THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY EDITORS OF SHAKESPEARE

by

ROBERT JOHN MILLS

©

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING, 1979

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Eighteenth-Century Editors of Shakespeare submitted by Robert John Mills in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

H. A. Hargreaves
(Supervisor)

G S McCaughey

James V DeFelice

a g Black
(External Examiner)

Date October 20, 1978

ABSTRACT

Eighteenth-century editors of Shakespeare have, until fairly recent times, been greatly underestimated by the majority of critics. Even today it is generally assumed that, while some of these editors might have espoused fairly sound editorial principles in the prefaces to their editions, their actual work on the text was disappointing. In one respect such criticism is justified. The earlier eighteenth-century editors would go to almost any lengths to "improve" Shakespeare's "barbarous utterings," and inevitably what they produced were editions which did not present what Shakespeare actually wrote, but rather what editors living more than a century later felt he should have written. It is the purpose of this study, however, to show that some of the criticisms which have been levelled against these early editors are grossly unfair. Certainly the century's earlier editors did not produce the types of editions that would be applauded today, but we must remember that the motives behind their editions were vastly different from those of modern editors. The task of the early eighteenth-century editor was to popularize Shakespeare, and he felt perfectly justified in employing any means to do so. As the eighteenth-century readers' knowledge and appreciation of Shakespeare's works increased, a different type of edition became necessary, and gradually a consistent technique of editing evolved which closely approximated the "limited eclecticism" of today. Indeed, the anticipation of modern editorial procedure by such editors as Capell and Malone is a most remarkable and neglected aspect of the history of Shakespearean textual scholarship.

The opening chapter of this study examines modern editorial technique. The contributions of such scholars as A.W. Pollard, R.B. McKerrow, W.W. Greg, Charlton Hinman and Fredson Bowers are discussed, with the aim of providing the reader with a comprehensive overview of the knowledge we now possess about Shakespeare's text, and an awareness of the rationale behind modern editorial procedures.

The second chapter presents a critical survey of the respective eighteenth-century editions of Shakespeare. As well as considering the editor's actual performance, the chapter attempts to provide a clear idea of the conditions under which each editor was working. Generally speaking, each of the editors appears to have been a dedicated and conscientious individual, who was guided in his editorial policy by the needs of the reading public.

The editorial labours of Alexander Pope, one of the most maligned of all eighteenth-century editors, are then examined. A careful textual study of Pope's work on The Tempest, Othello and Romeo and Juliet reveals that although he was certainly willing to alter Shakespeare's text where he thought alteration necessary, the majority of these alterations were made for what he considered to be sound and important reasons. One might justifiably condemn Pope's edition in some respects, but to claim that he approached his task halfheartedly or that he scamped his work is to be grossly unfair.

In chapter four Edward Capell's edition of Shakespeare is considered. I believe that Capell was the greatest of all the eighteenth-century editors, and indeed one of the most important editors of all time. After examining Capell's handling of the texts of such plays as The Tempest, Othello and Romeo and Juliet, as well as the various comments about editorial technique that he made in his Notes, one can only marvel at the remarkable nature of Capell's achievement. Possessing only a fraction of the knowledge that we now have about Shakespeare's text, Capell in many ways anticipated modern editorial procedure. Indeed, we all owe him a deep debt of gratitude for his attempts to restore Shakespeare's original text. He is perhaps one of our most unjustly neglected Shakespearean scholars.

To praise Capell's achievement is not to underestimate the importance of the "new bibliographers." Their respective contributions to our knowledge of Shakespeare's text are invaluable. However, the eighteenth-century editors also deserve credit for their endeavours. That a consistent and viable method of editing Shakespeare's works evolved during this period is a tribute to the diligence and intelligence of these pioneers of Shakespearean textual scholarship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. MODERN EDITORIAL THEORY 1

II. SHAKESPEARE'S EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY EDITORS 33

III. ALEXANDER POPE'S EDITION OF SHAKESPEARE 93

IV. EDWARD CAPELL'S EDITION OF SHAKESPEARE 147

V. CONCLUSION 197

***

FOOTNOTES 201

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 229

APPENDIX A 240

APPENDIX B 248

Chapter I

Modern Editorial Theory

In 1939 R.B. McKerrow published his now classic Prolegomena to the Oxford Shakespeare. This work has been of inestimable importance since it was here that concrete rules were first set down for the editing of Shakespeare. Several of McKerrow's ideas have since come under critical scrutiny, and it is perhaps now generally conceded that his editorial principles were, at least in part, too conservative to result in the best possible edition. However, the fact remains that McKerrow's Prolegomena brought to the fore many of the difficulties that had been plaguing editors for centuries, and provided the impetus behind much of the editorial discussion of the last forty years.

Perhaps the most important difference between McKerrow's editorial theory and that of eighteenth-century editors, at least up to Johnson, is their respective conceptions of what the editor is attempting to achieve. In the eighteenth century, one of the editor's most important goals was to make Shakespeare more accessible to the general reading public. It will be shown in the next chapter that for many in the eighteenth century reading Shakespeare's works had become tantamount to reading a foreign language. Also, Shakespeare's language, and the language of the Elizabethans in general, was not considered to be nearly as refined as that of the eighteenth century. Indeed many readers (and some editors) felt that since Shakespeare's language was the weakest part of his art, it was the duty of the editor to save Shakespeare from himself; to alter his language in order to clarify obscurities or to make the language more acceptable to eighteenth-century sensibilities. Some of the early editors of Shakespeare, then, probably regarded their primary task as one of popularization, and while none resorted to wholesale rewriting of Shakespeare, few displayed any qualms about altering his language if they felt their own wording was an improvement.

Such a conception of the task of the editor differs greatly from what we believe today. McKerrow's definition in his Prolegomena of what an ideal text would be is hard to improve upon:

> For scholarly purposes, the ideal text of the works of an early dramatist would be one which, on the positive side, should approach as closely as the extant material allows to a fair copy, made by the author himself, of his plays in the form which he intended finally to give them, and, on the negative side, should not in any way be coloured by the preconceived ideas or interpretations of later times.[1]

McKerrow goes on to admit that for Shakespeare this ideal is likely to remain very distant, but the important thing to notice here, I think, is that the ideal represents a basically different philosophy than that underlying the editing practices of the earlier eighteenth century.

Nowhere is this divergence more in evidence than in the theories of copy-text prominent in the eighteenth century and that enunciated by McKerrow in his Prolegomena and later refined by Greg and others. It might be a slight misnomer to speak of eighteenth-century ideas of copy-text, since the actual term was not invented until 1904 in McKerrow's edition of Nashe. However, in 1904 McKerrow simply meant by the term the text on which an editor bases his own, so in this simple sense early eighteenth-century editors were indeed making use of copy-text.

One of the major problems confronting anyone investigating eighteenth-century editorial technique is that all of the editors right up to Capell relied on their immediate predecessor's edition as the basis, or as copy-text, for their own. Theobald, Warburton,[2] and Johnson all attacked the many faults of their predecessors' editions, and yet the practice continued of using these same editions as copy-text, and the number of unnecessary errors continued to multiply. Obviously these men were not stupid, and it seems amazing that they did not see the folly of their ways. Although this problem will be dealt with in more detail in subsequent chapters, a few words about it are necessary here.

Again, in considering this issue, one must consult the motives of the respective editors. Even though the editors of the eighteenth century generally made a practice of attacking earlier editions in the most virulent manner imaginable, there can be little doubt that they generally believed their predecessors to be fairly intelligent men, and that they felt that as intelligent men worked on Shakespeare, certain definite improvements were bound to occur. Another characteristic of eighteenth-century editors, and I think it is fair to generalize here, is that they all held a rather high opinion of themselves. If the underlying goal of the eighteenth-century editor was to present an edition of Shakespeare which would be readable and understandable, and which would not offend eighteenth-century sensibilities, what better judge than himself? This, I think, is why we often find the rather curious practice of editors at times following a predecessor's edition and incorporating his emendations, and at other times making emendations which are either original or which follow some earlier edition. What appealed to their own sensibilities became the criterion of what was right.

Coupled with this general arrogance of eighteenth-century editors are several other factors which influenced their notions of copy-text. First of all, there existed a great pessimism as to the state of the early quartos. If the early quartos were all corrupt, the early editors felt that they could be of little authority, and no attempt was seriously made until Capell's edition to discover the true relationship between the folios and quartos. Of course, the early editors did realize that at least some of the quartos might possess authority, so from Pope's time on a more or less concerted effort was made to obtain as many early quartos as possible. Again, though, the method of using these quartos reflects the motives of the editor. If an editor liked a specific quarto reading he was usually arrogant enough not only to think that every other reader would approve of it, but also to believe that Shakespeare must have written it.

In The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text By His Earlier Editors, 1709-1768 McKerrow points out another possible reason for the eighteenth-century method of editing. It is McKerrow's contention that the eighteenth-century editors, who had all received a classical education, would naturally approach their task of editing Shakespeare in the same way that they would approach the editing of any classical text. McKerrow shows that in the majority of cases the available sources of classical texts are manuscripts which each represent the end of a separate line of descent, and that one is seldom able to work out their relationships with any certainty; hence a purely eclectic method of editing is the only method possible.

McKerrow then argues that this background affected the techniques of eighteenth-century editors of Shakespeare:

> ... it simply never occurred to men like Pope, Theobald, and Capell that the Shakespeare quartos were not in the same position with respect to the author's original text as the classical manuscripts were, in that they did not represent ends of separate lines of descent from it, but in most cases successive members of a single line. If they had reflected they would have seen that if we want Shakespeare's original text the only place where we have any chance of finding it is in a quarto or folio which is at the head of a line of descent, and that if descendants of such a quarto or folio have different readings from their ancestor, those readings must be either accidental corruptions or deliberate alterations by compositors or proof-readers, and can in no case have an authority superior to, or even as great as, the readings of the text from which they differ.[3]

Obviously, then, the theory of copy-text that McKerrow was to put forward in 1939 in his _Prolegomena_ differs greatly from that of most eighteenth-century editors. Perhaps McKerrow's conservatism in this issue might even be traced to his conviction that the eighteenth-century editors were wrong in their eclecticism. I hope to show that McKerrow goes a little too far in his criticism.

In the _Prolegomena_ McKerrow spends considerable time outlining in the clearest terms possible his theory of copy-text.[4] He begins by making the very important point that since we have no autograph manuscript of Shakespeare, or even any manuscript copy of such a manuscript, we must always rely on printed copies of his plays, and that these copies will be of varying authority. The only possible recourse for an editor, then, is, by careful study of the text, to attempt to find the most authoritative version of each play, and to reprint it as carefully as possible, emending only obvious errors. Of course, the only edition that can be of any possible authority is a substantive edition, one "which cannot have been derived from any other edition now extant, the source of such edition or editions having presumably been either a manuscript or an edition which has perished."[5]

Up to this point there can be no criticism of McKerrow's theories. For plays where we clearly have only one substantive edition, it would be illogical to use any other edition as copy-text, or to include, without careful consideration, emendations derived from any other source. Unfortunately, this simple principle was overlooked by all the editors of the eighteenth century, right up to Capell. Johnson perhaps realized the soundness of the theory, but unfortunately he failed to put it into practice.

Where McKerrow's hard and fast rule of copy-text begins to break down, however, is in his treatment of texts for which more than one substantive edition is extant, and in his treatment of texts for which a later derived edition contains revisions which are obviously authoritative. In his proposed treatment of these two cases McKerrow's theory is overly conservative. In the first case he contends that the only possible course of action is to decide, through critical judgment, which of the substantive editions to use as copy-text, and then to reprint that edition as carefully as possible, emending only obvious and manifest errors. In the second case he believes that once an editor has clearly established that authoritative revisions occur in a particular derived edition, it is his responsibility to reprint all substantive variations from the corrected edition. The editor, McKerrow believes, should not be allowed to pick and choose.

Obviously, such a method of editing is diametrically opposed to the purely eclectic methods that were so prominent during the eighteenth century, and no doubt McKerrow meant his methods to impose a much-needed discipline upon these editing techniques. However, it would seem that McKerrow went too far in the opposite direction. In a brilliant article entitled "McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered,"[6] W.W. Greg points out that to be forced to accept all of the substantive alterations in a derived edition simply because some may be authoritative is to put too firm a hold on the editor and in fact results in the abnegation of the editor's duty. Many variants in the derived edition, after all, might conceivably be the result of typographical considerations or compositorial error, and many might be revisions made by people other than the editor. Surely the only thing to do when one approaches the text of a play in this state is to accept only those alterations which the editor critically judges as emanating from the author.

In his definitive statement on the issue of copy-text, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," Greg clarifies what he considers to be the proper procedure for an editor faced with the problem outlined above:

> Granting that the fact of revision (or correction) is established, an editor should in every case of variation ask himself (1) whether the original reading is one that can reasonably be attributed to the author, and (2) whether the later reading is one that the author can reasonably be supposed to have substituted for the former. If the answer to the first question is negative, then the later reading should be accepted as at least possibly an authoritative correction (unless, of course, it is itself incredible). If the answer to (1) is affirmative and the answer to (2) is negative, the original reading should be retained. If the answers to both questions are affirmative, then the later reading should be presumed to be due to revision and admitted into the text, whether the editor himself considers it an improvement or not.
> It will be observed that one implication of this procedure is that a later variant that is either completely indifferent or manifestly inferior,

> or for the substitution of which no motive can be suggested, should be treated as fortuitous and refused admission to the text - to the scandal of the faithful followers of McKerrow.[7]

What Greg is advocating here is a type of limited eclecticism. It is my contention that this type of editorial procedure is in fact evident in Capell's edition, and is the natural outcome of editing practices in the eighteenth century. Certainly the early purely eclectic methods were incorrect, but Capell, it will be shown, at least attempted to follow the procedure that was prescribed by Greg some two hundred years later. Greg concludes his discussion of this issue by saying that he "consider[s] that it would be disastrous to curb the liberty of competent editors in the hope of preventing fools from behaving after their kind."[8] Capell was certainly not a fool.

Concerning the problem of editions for which more than one substantive text is extant, Greg, in his "McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered," disagrees with McKerrow's notion that one substantive text can be chosen on what seems to be little more than personal preference. Greg maintains that we must first of all have a clear notion of the nature of these substantive texts, and, if possible, of their relationship to one another. To support his claim, Greg points out that "Unless we realize ... that the Quartos of Richard III contain some sort of a reported text, while the folio represents in the main the stage copy, the choice between them can rest upon no more than personal literary taste."[9]

In fact, what Greg advocates for the editing of texts for which more than one substantive edition is extant is again a kind of limited eclecticism. His clearest statement of principle on this matter is found in "The Rationale of Copy-Text":

> ... whenever there is more than one substantive text of comparable authority, then although it will still be necessary to choose one of them as copy-text, and to follow it in accidentals, this copy-text can be allowed no overriding or even preponderant authority so far as substantive readings are concerned. The choice between these, in cases of variation, will be determined partly by the opinion the editor may form respecting the nature of the copy from which each substantive edition was printed, which is a matter of external authority; partly by the intrinsic authority of the several texts as judged by the relative frequency of manifest errors therein; and partly by the editor's judgement of the intrinsic claims of individual readings to originality - in other words their intrinsic merit, so long as by "merit" we mean the likelihood of their being what the author wrote rather than their appeal to the individual taste of the editor.[10]

This limited eclectic method of editing finds support from Fredson Bowers. In his "Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an Illustration from Dryden,"[11] Bowers attempts to answer anticipated criticisms of Greg's theories. His answers are indeed interesting and illuminating.

The first objection that Bowers foresees is one that likely has been anticipated by all readers, and the one that is levelled most often against the purely eclectic eighteenth-century editions. Where one does not mechanically stay with one text for all revisions, and if each variant in a revised edition must be considered on its own merits, what criteria can one possibly have for distinguishing between authoritative and non-authoritative readings? Bowers' answer to this problem is clear and to the point, and should be borne in mind in our consideration of all eighteenth-century editions:

> If an editor is not simply reprinting some single authority for the text but is engaging himself with a critical edition, which is supposed to present the best detailed text

> of an author in a form as close to his intentions as can be managed, then editorial responsibility cannot be disengaged from the duty to judge the validity of altered readings in a revised edition. Automatically to accept all the plausible readings in a revision is an unsound bibliographical principle.[12]

It seems to me that nearly all of the editors in the eighteenth century acted as if they were aware of this principle, and it indeed became part of Capell's editorial philosophy.

A second objection which Bowers foresees is that some might argue that Greg's proposals would result in an amalgamated or bastardized text; in other words, the resulting text would be little more than a rather haphazard combination of two or more other editions. This, certainly, is one of the main objections that can validly be levelled against most eighteenth-century editions, but not, as I hope to prove, against them all.

Bowers successfully defends Greg's methods here by distinguishing between a critical edition and a reprint of a single authority. Bowers brilliantly shows how an editor attempting a critical edition would actually come closest to the author's intentions by following Greg's method. Bowers' argument is ingenious, and deserves to be quoted in full:

> A revised edition is usually typeset from a copy of some previous edition suitably marked up by the author, although in some cases the author may, instead, submit a separate list of alterations which are to be made in the new edition. Let us suppose that the author's annotated copy used for a revision had been preserved. Certainly, no editor would print his critical text from the actual revised edition which was set from this marked copy. Without question he would feel obliged to choose the earlier (especially if it were the first edition) and to substitute the author's

> corrections in the same way that errata lists are incorporated. Thus, when Greg's theory is applied to revisions, it is seen that the preservation of the accidentals of the first edition but the insertion of authoritative substantive alterations from the revised text does, in fact, reproduce as nearly as possible the critical text as it would be made up from a preserved printer's copy for the revision.[13]

The third objection that Bowers foresees has to do with assigning variant accidentals in a revised edition to author or compositor, and hence the argument is of little relevance to eighteenth-century editors, who one and all assumed that matters of spelling and punctuation were under their control.[14] The argument, however, is interesting. Bowers sees some scholars objecting that by following the earliest text for accidentals some alterations that the author may have made in spelling, punctuation and capitalization would be missed. He points out, however, that through carelessness and through the process of modernization scores of unauthorized variants would appear for each one of authority. An editor's wisest course of action, then, would be to maintain the texture of the original edition.

Clearly, much has been added to our knowledge of copy-text in the last forty years, and editors today are approaching closer and closer to what Shakespeare actually wrote. It will not do, however, to be too condescending in our attitudes towards the efforts of eighteenth-century editors. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, knowledge of what copy-text should consist of was almost non-existent, but so was access to early quartos. As early quartos became more accessible, theories of copy-text were continually being refined, until with Capell and Malone we have editing techniques which, I believe, very closely approach those in practice today.

Yet even with Malone we see the essential distrust of the quartos that is found all the way through the eighteenth century. In 1709 Rowe claimed to have compared as many early quartos as possible to "give the true Reading as well as I could from thence."[15] However, investigation has shown that Rowe actually made very little use of any of the quartos in his possession; rather he relied almost exclusively on the Fourth Folio of 1685. As stated previously, editors from Pope on did make some effort to acquire as many of the quarto editions as possible, yet these quartos were generally not very extensively used. In fact, nearly all of the eighteenth-century editors, with the exception of Capell, adhered very closely to the folio tradition. Samuel Johnson, for example, relied almost exclusively on the First Folio for his edition, even though the nine years between the *Proposals* of 1756 and the actual edition of 1765 saw him arrive at a much higher opinion of the quartos. Even Malone, who had the benefit of Capell's edition, seemed easily to accept that most of the quartos were "stolen and surreptitious copies," yet his critical sense told him that in several cases they presented better texts than the folios. Why, then, did eighteenth-century editors put such trust in the folio tradition, while generally rejecting most, if not all, of the quartos?

The answer would appear to lie in their interpretation of the claims made by Heminge and Condell in the famous preface to the First Folio. As the reader will remember, the editors of the First Folio claimed to be presenting Shakespeare's plays to the public for the first time "published according to the true original copies." Before their edition, the reader had been abused by "divers stolen and surreptitious copies" and by "maimed and deformed" works. Most eighteenth-century editors of Shakespeare apparently accepted this claim at face value, and hence followed the only logical course, basing their editions on the folios. The problem with this simple course of action, however, was that in a number of cases all that the Folio editors did was reprint some early quarto, without making any significant alterations. What, then, was the early editor of Shakespeare to believe? If the editors of the First Folio were merely reprinting earlier quartos, which they themselves had said were "maimed and deformed," they were indeed acting in a very unscrupulous manner. Could such unscrupulous editors be trusted to provide accurate texts for any of Shakespeare's plays? Generally the attitude of the eighteenth-century editor seemed to be that the Folio editors could not be trusted, but that what they provided was better than any other text which might be available. Textual pessimism, therefore, reigned supreme throughout the eighteenth century, and had much to do with the free attitude towards emendations that was so prevalent during the time. Having nothing but corrupt and untrustworthy texts from which to pick alternate readings, many of the early editors felt perfectly justified in substituting their own conjectures. Johnson and Malone certainly imposed a much-needed discipline, but Capell alone seems to have coupled discipline with a proper attitude towards the quartos. Unfortunately, Malone largely ignored Capell's work on the quartos, and, no doubt seduced by Malone's eloquence, so did many of the nineteenth-century editors. It is one of the great ironies of the textual history of Shakespeare that such a great critic as Malone, who did so much to establish proper editing techniques, was also largely responsible for a whole century of wrong thinking about the quartos.

It was not until 1909 and the publication of A.W. Pollard's Shakespeare Folios and Quartos[16] that serious thought was again given to the relative authority of the various quartos. Arguing from what seems today to be a rather obvious point, Pollard attempted to clear the tarnished name of the Folio editors by basing his discussion of the authenticity of the quartos on an interpretation of the word "divers." The Folio editors, as we have seen, claimed that before the publication of their edition the public had been abused with "divers stolen and surreptitious copies." Now, if the Folio editors meant that all of the quartos published before their edition were "stolen and surreptitious" they had indeed acted in an unscrupulous manner by reprinting some of these quartos for their own edition. However, Pollard contended that by "divers" the Folio editors meant "some," and hence not all of the early quartos were disreputable; some were legitimate. Of course, by raising this issue Pollard was making the task of the editor much more difficult. No longer could editors reject the quartos on principle, like Johnson, or merely accept the earliest quartos, like Malone. Critical and bibliographical knowledge was now necessary, and the work of Capell began to look more and more advanced.

Admittedly, others had also recognized that the quartos were of varying authority. Malone felt that the quarto editions for The Merry Wives of Windsor and King Henry V were worse than the others,[17] and Sidney Lee, in 1902, decided that only six of the quartos were manifestly corrupt. However, that the quartos were generally condemned as late as the early nineteen-hundreds can be seen from Lee's attitude:

> It is not easy to exaggerate the narrowness
> of policy which actuated the Elizabethan
> publisher's treatment of plays. In his crass

> endeavour to satisfy the new-born taste for the published drama, he ignored not merely the material interest of author or manager, but the intelligent interest of the reader. If he cared little about the manner in which he acquired a copy of a play, he cared not at all whether or not it correctly presented the author's text. Both the author's manuscript and the authentic transcript which was in the hands of the theatrical manager frequently lay beyond the publisher's reach. Often he printed a crude draft of a piece which had been taken down, whether in shorthand or in longhand, by an enterprising visitor to the playhouse, from the actors' lips in course of the performance. Incoherence and confusing omissions commonly characterized the result.... More frequently the publisher would bribe a scrivener, or perhaps an actor, into procuring for him a rough copy of the play which had been carelessly transcribed for some subordinate purpose of the playhouse. Such a transcript seldom proved faithful to the author's intention. In most instances it was unsparingly abridged, or it was defaced by actors' interpolations, and by ignorant errors of the copyist which the printer's reader made little effort to amend.
>
> The greater number of the quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays which were published in his lifetime seem to have been printed from more or less imperfect and unauthorized playhouse transcripts which were obtained by publishers more or less dishonestly.[18]

In a scathing attack upon Lee, Greg caustically remarks in reference to the above: "How easy it is to paint a graphic picture of the past unhampered by a knowledge of the facts."[19]

The importance of Pollard's distinction between the good and bad quartos, then, cannot be overemphasized. In an argument that is at once clear and concise, Pollard manages to change the course of Shakespearean editing after over one hundred years of wrong thinking.[20] Pollard begins his argument by stating that of the plays found in the First Folio, seventeen had been previously published in quarto form, and that Hamlet and Romeo and Juliet had been twice published, in widely differing quarto versions. In other words, by Pollard's count there are nineteen quarto versions of Shakespeare's plays preceding the First Folio. Of these nineteen quartos, five are recognized as being corrupt: the earlier Hamlet, the earlier Romeo and Juliet, Henry V, The Merry Wives of Windsor and Pericles. The corruption of these early quartos is evident not only because they compare so unfavourably with the Folio texts, but also because they come nowhere near the standard of the remaining quarto texts.

But Pollard does not rely completely upon internal evidence to prove his case. He also attempts to show how the so-called "bad" quartos were, without exception, issued in some peculiar way, while the "good" quartos generally were issued in a normal fashion. As Pollard says:

> ... if we take the quartos which can be proved to have been, directly or indirectly, the source of the text of the First Folio, or those generally which are pronounced by independent authorities to have "good" texts obviously belonging to the same family as those of the First Folio, we find that with the single exception of Love's Labour's Lost, which will be separately considered, they all agree in having been entered, before their first publication in print, in the Stationer's Registers....
>
> On the other hand, if we take the quartos which have "bad" texts, differing widely and for the worse from those of the First folio, we shall find that they also agree in one point, that is in either not being entered prior to first publication in the Stationers' Registers at all, or in having an entry of an unusual nature, entitling us to suspect something wrong....
>
> Finding, then, as we do, that quartos which have good texts and agree with the First Folio are entered regularly in the Stationers' Registers, and that quartos which have bad texts, not agreeing at all with the First Folio,

> are entered in the Stationers' Registers either irregularly or not at all, we are surely justified in arguing, by what used to be called in Logic the method of Agreement and Difference, that there is some causal relation at work which connects a good text with regular entry prior to publication in the Stationers' Register.[21]

Pollard later clarifies his argument by pointing out that although neither the later Hamlet nor Romeo and Juliet quartos was entered in the Stationers' Registers in the customary manner, since they were both simply replacing early corrupt quartos there probably was no need for a new entry. Pollard argues along similar lines for Love's Labour's Lost, which also was not entered. Even though we know of no corrupt early quarto of this play, there probably was one since the extant quarto contains the words "Newly corrected and augmented" on its title page. Pollard does not contend that all of the fourteen "good" quartos are of the same quality, or that the Folio editors made equal use of them all,[22] but he does maintain that they are generally of the same quality as those texts printed in the Folio for the first time, and that none of them is corrupt enough to throw any serious doubts upon its authenticity. Also, all have a respectable bibliographical origin. The crux of Pollard's argument, then, is simply that some quarto editions are much better than others, and that generally the editors of the First Folio acted in a responsible manner by selecting the best possible texts for their own edition. Hence what Pollard does is to free editors from the cloud of textual pessimism that had hung for so long over both the quarto and folio traditions. The quartos could not be dismissed out of hand as being corrupt, and the Folio editors could not be dismissed as being corrupt opportunists. Obviously, one of the primary duties of the editor was going to be deciding, by critical means rather than by arbitrary rules, which edition of Shakespeare to use as the basis of his own.

In his discussion of Pollard's argument, Greg, while praising the end result of Pollard's inquiry, also felt compelled to show how the symmetry of Pollard's argument has been somewhat blurred by more recent textual investigations.[23] For example, it has been shown that a number of plays with perfectly respectable texts were, for one reason or another, never entered in the Stationers' Registers. The reverse also holds true. Plays with bad texts were often entered. Hence, Pollard's correlation between authoritative texts and those entered in the Stationers' Registers has come to rest on very shaky ground. Furthermore, Greg points out that the origin of some of the "good" quarto texts might not be as respectable as Pollard maintained:

> This applies particularly to King Lear. Unless I am mistaken, and what would be more surprising Sir Edmund Chambers is equally and independently so, the text of the quarto of 1608, though on a very different level of accuracy from those of the recognized "bad" quartos, is like these a report based on actual performance, and therefore presumably piratical and surreptitious. Yet, it was quite regularly entered in the Stationers' Register, and I have no doubt myself - though it has been questioned - that Pollard was right in supposing it to have been used in printing the folio text.[24]

Greg admits, however, that the Folio editors only made use of this quarto after it had undergone extensive revision, so quite possibly they were being true to their word by only presenting plays in which the texts had been cured and made perfect.

It would seem, then, that the Folio editors at least attempted to make use of the best texts possible. For about one-third of the plays in the Folio they employed quarto texts that had been previously published. Apparently they also possessed manuscripts which they considered to be somehow superior or preferable to some of the quarto texts, since a number of the original quartos were revised considerably by reference to some other source. In some instances, however, the Folio editors seemed content simply to reprint the previous quarto texts with only a minimum of revision. For the remainder of the plays the editors relied on manuscripts which have long since disappeared, and for the authority of which we have only their word. The reader can see, then, where Pollard's vindication of the quarto and Folio texts was leading the editor. It now became one of the editor's primary duties to investigate as completely as possible the nature of all of Shakespeare's various texts. Editors now had to ask themselves what sorts of manuscripts lay under the various quarto texts and plays published for the first time in Folio. How authoritative were these manuscripts, and from where did the various alterations in the text emanate? Such enquiries, as we shall see, lead the editor into a great labyrinth of unanswered questions; and the most frustrating thing of all is that many of the answers to these questions remain matters of speculation, defying ultimate proof. Even to approach such questions requires a vast knowledge of bibliographical and textual matters never dreamt of by editors in the eighteenth century.

The whole field of textual transmission is so vast and encompasses so many different theories that I shall only attempt to deal with some of the main influential ideas.[25] Again we must first examine the ideas of A.W. Pollard, which, if rather outdated now, did provide the catalyst that sparked much-needed further investigation into this primary area of Shakespearean textual research.

Pollard again returns to the famous preface of the First Folio as the basis of his argument. Here, the editors claimed that Shakespeare's papers "scarce received from him a blot." How, Pollard argues, would Heminge and Condell know this if they were not in possession of at least some of Shakespeare's original autograph papers? Basing his argument on the fact that we know today of at least three manuscript prompt-books that are in the handwriting of the original authors, Pollard argues that Shakespeare followed the same course and simply submitted his autograph papers, which, if sufficiently clear, would become the prompt-book, and, if not, would be transcribed in the theatre. As Pollard says in his Foundations of Shakespeare's Text:

> In the case of some plays by other playwrights we find that it was the author's autograph manuscript which was first submitted to the censor and then used as a prompt copy and equipped with the notes and stage-directions necesssary for this purpose. From the notes and stage-directions which occur in some of the printed quartos there is a high probability that these were printed from prompt copies, and if what happened with other plays by other playwrights is any guide to what happened to Shakespeare's, some of these prompt copies were probably in his autograph. Some of them, also, were probably not; but it may be claimed that at every stage in the passage of a play from Shakespeare's study the balance of probabilities is in favour of optimism. Thus, firstly, when there was a risk of piracy it would be foolish to increase that risk by making a single needless transcript. Secondly, in view of the insistence of the censor that a play should be acted in exact conformity with the copy on which the licence was inscribed, the greatest proof of obedience on the part of the players would be to put this inscribed copy in the hands of the prompter as a guarantee against gag. Thirdly, as a ready means of persuading the wardens of the Stationers' Company that a play might be printed without special 'authority' being obtained for it, the production of the

> manuscript on which the censor's licence was inscribed, as the copy sent to the printer, would carry all before it.[26]

Pollard's argument is indeed attractive, and when we realize that he is simply claiming that some of the first editions of Shakespeare's plays were probably printed from his own autograph manuscripts, it does not seem that he is claiming anything beyond belief. However, critics soon realized that Pollard's attractive theory was in need of some modification. W.W. Greg, in The Shakespeare First Folio, points out that Pollard's argument in fact fails to prove that any of Shakespeare's plays were printed from manuscripts in his own handwriting. Greg concedes that there is no reason to believe that Shakespeare ever handed over anything else but his own drafts to the theatrical company, but where Pollard's argument breaks down, Greg believes, is in his contention that original drafts were ever used as prompt-books. Greg argues his case as follows:

> Pollard himself points out that what Shakespeare handed over were his original drafts - what Daborne called the foul sheets - and although the players commented on the absence of erasures, it would be rash to conclude that they were in a fit state to serve the prompter - at any rate without supporting evidence. This Pollard thought he had found in three autograph prompt-books that survive, although in order to provide relevant evidence it would have to be shown that they were not merely autograph but foul papers, which cannot be suggested of more than one of them. Besides, none of them can be taken as typical.... Thus the three examples that Pollard selected do very little to support his case, and though other autograph prompt-books may exist, they are not really any more relevant.[27]

Going on, Greg contends that the main difficulty with Pollard's argument is that it lacks any connecting link: "either evidence that Shakespeare sometimes made fair copies of his plays or that foul papers normally became prompt-books."[28] Greg concedes, however, that it is basically the form of Pollard's argument that is incorrect, and that his own criticisms do not show that some of Shakespeare's plays had not in fact been printed from autograph copy.

In 1931, however, R.B. McKerrow formulated a theory about printer's copy that was to receive almost universal praise and acceptance.[29] Addressing himself to the problem of "whether a bad text is likely to be a bad reproduction of a good manuscript or a good reproduction of a bad one,"[30] McKerrow points out the very interesting fact that Elizabethan printers generally made a very creditable job of reproducing non-dramatic works. Is it reasonable to assume, McKerrow asks, that the printers would, for some reason, sink greatly beneath their normal standards when printing dramatic works? Surely it is more reasonable to assume that the fault lay in the manuscripts that were presented to the printer.

McKerrow contends that since a legible copy of each play had to be submitted for the approval of the censor, the companies themselves must have had good manuscripts of all the plays which they performed. The companies, fearing loss or damage to these manuscripts which, in all probability, eventually became prompt-books, would naturally be loath to submit these manuscripts to the printer. The natural alternative, McKerrow argues, was to submit the author's foul papers, from which the fair copy had been prepared. He succinctly summarizes his argument in the following paragraph:

> My suggestion is, then, that one of the
> reasons for the badness of dramatic texts
> is that they were often set up from the

> author's original manuscript and not from a fair-copy such as would be usual in the case of other books. And we must remember that the original manuscript of a play would not have been written with any thought of the press. It was not intended for the study, or for the minute discussion of students three hundred years away in the future. It was not a literary document at all. It was merely the substance, or rather the bare bones, of a performance on the stage, intended to be interpreted by actors skilled in their craft, who would have no difficulty in reading it as it was meant to be read. To a compositor, however, it may well have been much more confusing than any literary manuscript, even in the author's original draft.[31]

McKerrow's argument is certainly convincing; however, as R.C. Bald points out, the one strong objection to McKerrow's theory is that it cannot be proved.[32]

Fredson Bowers sets up some strong opposition to McKerrow's theory in his On Editing Shakespeare.[33] After listing the various types of copy which might have been supplied to the Elizabethan printer,[34] Bowers makes the point that McKerrow's theory has become too much a matter of faith, and the time has come for reconsideration. As Bowers says, "In my own opinion the present-day tendency to the mass assignment of any printer's copy as foul papers, when there is some presumed evidence in the printed text of authorial characteristics and none of the theatrical prompt copy, has gone too far and is in need of re-examination not only on grounds of probability but also in the light of evidence which has not been brought to bear on the problem."[35] Bowers' new argument is difficult, especially for those not familiar with the somewhat specialized language of the bibliographer, so perhaps it might first of all be wise to quote Honigmann's succinct summary of Bowers' position:

> Bowers ... conjectured that more texts than the two postulated (foul papers; fair copy later used as prompt-book) must have existed in the early history of a play. 'Fouler papers' might precede the foul papers; and an intermediate fair copy, not necessarily without some deletions and afterthoughts, intervened, in his opinion, between the foul papers and the second fair copy that would become the prompt-book.[36]

Honigmann then points out that Bowers in effect argues against McKerrow's belief that normally the players would hand foul papers to the printers. Rather, Bowers contends that while this might occasionally have been the case, there is no evidence to support the belief that it frequently happened. As Bowers himself says: "I am not concerned to argue that the theatre never received an author's foul papers, but only that, in more cases than we have customarily thought, it is very probable fair copy was submitted instead."[37]

The textual implications of what Bowers says here, of course, are enormous. Relying on the old theory that printer's copy normally consisted of the author's foul papers, a number of editors had felt justified in making emendations based on the belief, as Bowers says, "that such papers would have been considerably worked over, interlined, and side-noted and in places almost illegible."[38] Furthermore, in some cases, notably the second quarto of Hamlet, some editors had contended that corruptions arose because of the printers' inability to read the composing author's careless handwriting. However, if we concede that the usual printer's copy was not the author's foul papers, but rather the author's fair copied papers, the editor is forced to change a great deal of his thinking.

Bowers, however, is never one to make rash statements without the necessary qualifications, and his theory of the fair copied papers is no exception. Realizing that some editors might be prone to excess on the other side, Bowers stresses the point that such a fair copy might also cause the editor a number of problems. On some occasions a perfectly fair copy might have been made into a prompt-book, with all its attendant problems; and also, as Bowers point out, "Few authors can resist the opportunity to revise during the course of copying, and a conscientious author after copying might make some number of further revisions involving interlineation, marginal addition, and the like."[39] Certainly, then, Bowers is not claiming that since the manuscript lying behind a quarto might have been a "fair copy" no editorial emendations are possible; he is simply pleading for caution in this regard.

Bowers then makes the point already mentioned, that perhaps on some occasions an intermediate scribal fair copy of the author's foul papers might have served as printer's copy:

> ... I should scarcely wish to deny that Shakespeare, or some other well-established dramatist, could not sometimes have contented himself ... with submitting something like foul papers, though not necessarily his original drafts. I should suggest, nevertheless, that we are not thereby automatically justified in assuming that these papers would always have been transcribed directly into prompt-copy, and would therefore have been preserved to become the manuscript given the printer. In some cases, especially if the papers were not in very good shape, it could well have been expedient, in lieu of the author's fair copy, for a theatrical scribe to make an intermediate transcript of them for consideration, revision, submission to the censor, copying of the parts, or sometimes for marking and cutting in preparation for the final prompt book. And if this were so, it is likely that not the discarded foul papers but instead this

> scribal copy was the manuscript preserved as a duplicate and thus given to the printer.[40]

The significance of all this is obvious. Even if the scribe attempted to reproduce as faithfully as possible the manuscript in front of him, without attempting to clean up any difficulties that he might see, some amount of scribal corruption is inevitable; and the editor must react accordingly.

The reader by this point is no doubt asking himself what all of this can possibly have to do with eighteenth-century techniques of editing Shakespeare. The simple answer is that it has practically nothing to do with it. That, in fact, is precisely my point. Now that the reader has refreshed his memory about merely some of the major textual breakthroughs that have been made in our own century, it is, I think, possible to appreciate even more the miraculous progress that was made during the eighteenth century, when all of this knowledge was not even dreamt of. I certainly would never be so bold or so foolish as to say that Capell's or Malone's edition of Shakespeare were superior, or even equal, to the editions, say, of the New Arden editors. But I would contend that many of the editing techniques now popular were at least approximated by the later eighteenth-century editors. And the amazing thing is that these techniques were approximated without the aid of modern bibliographical knowledge.

Before concluding our summary of the major textual issues that have arisen during the twentieth century, it is essential to mention the tremendous advances in knowledge that have also been made concerning the actual printing and proof-reading of Shakespeare's plays. In the eighteenth century, it was generally assumed that Shakespeare's plays were printed without any kind of proof-correction, and this attitude, of course, only justified many editors' convictions that they should serve as proof-readers, and make the necessary changes and adjustments that Shakespeare would have made, had he taken the trouble to examine the proofs himself. The majority of eighteenth-century editors never seemed to realize just how important the issue of proof-reading really is. If the author himself examined the proofs, or even if the press employed a proof-reader who compared the proofs with an authoritative copy, it is essential that the editor have knowledge of the corrected reading. However, if proofing was done by a proof-reader without the aid of authoritative copy, if he simply acted on his own whims, then it becomes necessary for the editor to know the original, uncorrected reading.

In 1935 Percy Simpson published his Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries.[41] Bringing together a vast amount of material dealing with the relationship between authors and printers for three centuries, Simpson added much to our knowledge of early proof-reading practices. Basically, Simpson shows that the amount and nature of proof-reading varied greatly according to both the printer and the type of work being printed. Learned works often received a very careful proof-reading, often by the author himself. More popular works, such as dramas, however, received either a very cursory proof-reading, or none at all. Occasionally a dramatic author would attend closely to the printing of his own works, proofing the sheets himself, but unfortunately it is clear that Shakespeare, in contrast to his contemporary, Ben Jonson, never took the trouble to do so. There is no evidence that Shakespeare ever oversaw the printing of any of his quartos; and it seems far more likely that any corrections which were made to his plays as they passed through the press were made by the printers.

Proof-reading of the Folio texts was apparently equally haphazard. In what is certainly one of the most important studies ever made on Shakespeare's text, The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare, Charlton Hinman, by an exhaustive comparison of approximately eighty copies of the First Folio,[43] arrives at the conclusion that if the Folio had never been proof-read at all, we would only be the poorer for two rather insignificant readings in The Two Gentlemen of Verona, and one stage direction in Julius Caesar. Hinman summarizes his findings about the proof-reading of the First Folio as follows:

> ... the proofing that was done for the book achieved little indeed except in the way of obviating a fair number of superficial faults. There was a good deal of proof-correction. Over 500 changes were made. Very few substantive errors, however, were noticed at all; for the reader paid scant attention to these , and only on rare occasions did he consider it necessary for his purposes to read proof against the copy. Not that he absolutely never did so. Two substantive errors in the Folio were quite certainly corrected by reference to copy, and some five or six others probably were. In these instances a good reading replaces one that is either manifestly wrong or at any rate not necessarily what Shakespeare wrote. Yet in at least as many instances the correction process , far from substituting a good reading for a less satisfactory one, only introduces a new error.
>
> ... In general, ... [the proof-reader] appears to have been perfectly content to trust the compositors to reproduce the essential substance of the copy they used. For there can be no escaping the conclusion that the ultimate objective of proof-reading that was done for the Folio was rather to eliminate superficial blemishes than, by regular checking of proof against copy, to ensure substantive textual accuracy.[44]

Alice Walker has said that, "... one of the big questions which affects the editing of texts for which the Folio's authority is the higher is how far the Folio compositors can be relied on to have reproduced accurately their copy."[45] In The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare, Hinman does much to add to our knowledge of the performance of these compositors. Through a careful analysis of recurring types, Hinman is able to prove conclusively that the Folio was not set by only two compositors, as was customarily believed, but that there were really no less than five compositors at work during various stages of the printing. The information that Hinman is able to supply about the characteristics of these various compositors should prove invaluable to the editor. For example, an editor obviously would be much more conservative in emending the text set by a compositor who generally worked in an efficient manner, than he would be in handling the text set by a more careless workman. One of Hinman's most interesting discoveries is that one of the compositors, deisgnated by Hinman as compositor E, was in all likelihood an apprentice; and as such he was likely allowed to set type only from printed copy, and all of the copy which he did set was apparently carefully proof-read.[46] The importance of these discoveries for future editors is obvious.

Another of Hinman's very important discoveries is that, contrary to long-standing belief, the text of the Folio was not set seriatim, but rather by formes.[47] This method of composition required the accurate estimating and casting off of text material for each type page, and, as Hinman points out, it was inevitable that errors were occasionally made. In order to have the text of a certain page finish exactly where it should, compositors were occasionally guilty of such textual tamperings as changing or leaving out words, or printing a prose passage as verse or a verse passage as prose. Hinman's information is invaluable for showing just when a compositor might have resorted to such tactics.

The summary provided in this chapter of the advancements that have been made in textual knowledge during the twentieth century has only attempted to show some of the aspects with which a competent editor of Shakespeare must be familiar. Samuel Johnson, writing in 1765, chastised Alexander Pope for calling the duty of the editor "dull." Johnson was aware that any competent editor of Shakespeare had to be far more than a dull pedant; he had to possess a very wide range of knowledge. As Johnson said:

> ... an emendatory critick would ill discharge his duty, without qualities very different from dullness. In perusing a corrupted piece, he must have before him all possibilities of meaning, with all possibilities of expression. Such must be his comprehension of thought, and such his copiousness of language. Out of many readings possible, he must be able to select that which best suits with the state, opinions, and modes of language prevailing in every age, and with his authour's particular cast of thought, and turn of expression. Such must be his knowledge, and such his taste. Conjectural criticism demands more than humanity possesses, and he that exercises it with most praise has very frequent need of indulgence. Let us now be told no more of the dull duty of an editor.[48]

One can only imagine the pleasure that Johnson would have in discussing textual problems with someone like Greg or Hinman. Interestingly, many of Greg's pronouncements on the editing of Shakespeare's text closely mirror what Johnson had said approximately two hundred years earlier. If Greg ever made one statement summing up his whole philosophy of editing, and indeed justifying all of the work done by the "new bibliographers," it must be his statement that "no emendation can, or ought to be, considered in vacuo, but ... criticism must always proceed in relation to what we know, or what we surmise, respecting the history of the text."[49] We today know a great deal more about the history of the text than we could ever expect an eighteenth-century editor to know, but clearly Johnson and men like him realized the necessity for knowledge, and, as I hope to prove, their editions were remarkable given the information that they possessed.

F.P. Wilson concludes his summary of the principles of textual criticism that have been devised in the twentieth century by saying that "Critical bibliography has devised no new methods in emendatory criticism, but it can claim to have put the old methods to a more expert and disciplined use."[50] Certainly this is true, and it is interesting to note that both W.W. Greg and the later eighteenth-century editors agree on one point: that one should exhaust all possibilities of retaining a reading before emendation is made. Johnson expressed his main guiding principle for his edition as follows: "I have adopted the Roman sentiment, that it is more honourable to save a citizen, than to kill an enemy, and have been more careful to protect than to attack."[51] Compare this philosophy with the following statement by Greg:

> Explanation is safer and less heady work than conjecture, and even when perverse it has served both to define the possibilities of interpretation and to help the formation of a severer code of emendation. Only through the discipline of endless trial and failure can be won the sure sense of where explanation becomes impossible and alteration of the text necessary. It is the fine flower of criticism, and few attain it.[52]

I believe that Greg's final statement here has a direct bearing on the study of the efforts of eighteenth-century Shakespearean editors. As we shall see, the history of eighteenth-century editing reflects an almost continuous movement towards the type of discipline which Greg called "the fine flower of criticism." Men such as Johnson, Capell, and Malone certainly possessed the characteristics and desire for knowledge that are today recognized as being so important for the editor. Wilson makes the following comment about the nature of the modern editor: "To no aspect of Elizabethan literature, language, or life can an editor afford to be indifferent, and the ideal editor is at once bibliographer and critic, historian and antiquary, palaeographer, philologist, philosopher, and theologian."[53] It will be one of the primary goals of this dissertation to show the extent to which the respective editors of the eighteenth century embodied these criteria, and to show how effectively they made use of the limited knowledge that was available to them.

Chapter II

Shakespeare's Eighteenth-Century Editors

In order to understand the mentality that caused eighteenth-century editors to handle Shakespeare's text as they did, it is essential to have some idea of what the general public thought of Shakespeare. One of the most curious productions of the Restoration and the eighteenth century was the multitude of adapatations of Shakespearean plays that appeared during this period. Although these plays have been generally, and perhaps somewhat unfairly, maligned by the majority of modern critics, they nevertheless present us with a very clear indication of what the audience of the time admired and disliked about Shakespeare.

There were, of course, many aspects of Shakespeare's writing that the Restoration and eighteenth-century audiences greatly admired. Even the authors prominent in the adapting of Shakespeare praised his plays on many accounts. John Dryden, for example, in An Essay on Dramatic Poetry, had Neander say in reference to Shakespeare:

> He was the man who of all modern, and perhaps ancient poets, had the largest and most comprehensive soul. All the images of Nature were still present to him, and he drew them, not laboriously, but luckily; when he describes anything, you more than see it, you feel it too. Those who accuse him to have wanted learning, give him the greater commendation: he was naturally learned; he needed not the spectacles of books to read Nature; he looked inwards and found her there.[1]

Even though Neander goes on to criticize Shakespeare for being occasionally flat, insipid, or overly bombastic, his final assessment is favourable: "He is always great when some great occasion is presented to him; no man could say he ever had a fit subject for his wit and did not then raise himself high above the rest of poets, Quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi."[2] This was high praise indeed, but no higher than Dryden accorded Shakespeare in the preface to his adaptation of Troilus and Cressida. Here Dryden stated that "our reverence for Shakespeare [is] much more just, than that of the Grecians for AEschylus."[3] Dryden was certainly not going against the general critical belief of the times here. Shakespeare was admired, and was admired greatly, but with certain very definite reservations.

Of course, it was these reservations that prompted the alteration of Shakespeare. One might assume that someone who admired Shakespeare as greatly as Dryden did would have been opposed to any kind of alteration to his text, but this was not the case. Dryden began his career as an adapter of Shakespeare by collaborating with Sir William D'Avenant in the writing of The Tempest; or The Enchanted Island. This work was produced in 1667 and published in 1670. Dryden later wrote his two most famous adaptations of Shakespeare, All for Love, or The World Well Lost (printed 1678) and Troilus and Cressida, or Truth Found Too Late (printed 1679). Admittedly, these last two plays were not really adaptations but rather were completely different plays, which were based on Shakespeare's plots but which retained little of his dialogue. Yet it is interesting to consider why Dryden felt that new plays were necessary. Fortunately, Dryden fully described his attitude towards the alteration of Shakespeare in his preface to Troilus and Cressida. In this very important and influential critical document, Dryden criticized Shakespeare primarily because of the type of language that he characteristically employed:

> Yet it must be allowed to the present age, that the tongue in general is so much refined since Shakespeare's time, that many of his words, and more of his phrases, are scarce intelligible. And of those which we understand, some are ungrammatical, others coarse; and his whole style is so pestered with figurative expressions, that it is as affected as it is obscure.[4]

Here Dryden discussed the one aspect of Shakespeare that the Restoration and eighteenth century could not admire, and, as pointed out in chapter one, it is an aspect that must be carefully considered when one looks at the editing techniques prominent at least during the early part of the eighteenth century. If Shakespeare's language was scarcely intelligible to the eighteenth-century reader, was it not the editor's task to make it more intelligible? If the language was coarse and ungrammatical, should it be allowed to remain so? These were just some of the questions that had to be confronted by the early eighteenth-century editor, and, as we have already seen, a number of these early editors had vastly different conceptions of their task than what we have today.

The adapters of Shakespeare felt that it was their duty to improve Shakespeare, or to make him polite enough for the highly civilized world of the eighteenth century. James R. Sutherland perhaps best categorizes the eighteenth-century adapter's attitude when he says in reference to Shakespeare: "It was a kindness to save him from himself; the Tates, the Cibbers, the Aaron Hills who produced adaptations of his plays usually did so from the best of motives. Shakespeare was his own worst enemy; he had to be polished and put in order if he was to appeal to a politer age."[5]

In their desire to make Shakespeare's language suitable to the eighteenth-century stage, the adapters made a number of important alterations to the original text. While a detailed examination of these changes lies outside the scope of this study,[6] it might be helpful to look briefly at several types of changes that were made. A knowledge of these changes will, if nothing else, provide a greater insight into the intellectual climate of the period during which our editors were working.

The most common sorts of changes that were made to Shakespeare's language, and which had the greatest effect on early editions, were those made purely for the sake of clarity. As Dryden said, much of Shakespeare's language was considered ungrammatical, and the adapters made even the smallest changes to render Shakespeare grammatically correct. George C. Branum supplies some interesting examples of the types of small grammatical changes that the Restoration or eighteenth-century adapter felt obliged to make.[7] For example, Aaron Hill changed the verb "Sit" to "Sits" in "Reproach and everlasting Shame,/Sits, mocking, on our Plumes!". George Colman changed a line of King Lear from Shakespeare's "And bring you where both fire and food is ready" to the more grammatical "are." Also, the adapters often rejected "that" and "which" as relative pronouns referring to persons. The examples which Branum cites of this preference are Dennis' changing of Shakespeare's "he is a Lyon,/ That I am proud to hunt" to "Whom," and Richard Cumberland's changing the original "Lord Timon wilt be left a naked gull,/ Which flashes now a Phoenix," to "Who." These minor changes are unimportant when one is dealing solely with the adaptations, but they become extremely important when one looks at the editions. It is just this sort of small grammatical alteration that many of the early editors felt justified in making.

Equally important to the editing of Shakespeare was the notion that Shakespeare's metrics were often faulty. The eighteenth-century critic felt that it was essential for major characters in a tragedy to speak in blank verse, since only through blank verse could such characters achieve the proper dignity necessary for the genre. It was permissible to have clowns or common people speak in prose, but a tragic figure would be considered little more than laughable if he descended to such a low form of speech. Shakespeare generally adhered to this distinction, but there are occasions where some of his tragic characters slip into prose, placing a considerable strain on the eighteenth-century sensibility. Although no eighteenth-century editor actually made wholesale changes in Shakespeare's prosody, several editors felt justified in occasionally making such alterations. We shall take special note of this peculiarity when we come to a discussion of Pope's edition.

Similarly, several eighteenth-century editors felt a compulsion to "correct" Shakespeare's meter when they considered it to be careless or irregular. Such a practice was also very widespread in the adaptations, especially in those written before the middle of the eighteenth century. As Branum says, "... any line of Shakespearean blank verse containing less than the required five feet was likely to be corrected, and substitutions for iambic feet (or 'careless' irregularities) replaced to create a consistent pattern of iambic verse."[8]

Several other important changes were also made to Shakespeare's language. Long speeches were often greatly condensed, with the aim of making the speech simpler and clearer, or simply briefer. One of the most serious objections that the Restoration and eighteenth century had to Shakespeare's language was to his excessive use of puns, and a toning down of these puns can be seen in all of the adaptations of the period and even in some of the editions. The critics of the time were never more unanimous than in their condemnation of this aspect of Shakespeare's language. Addison, for example, began Spectator #61 by saying:

> There is no kind of false wit which has been so recommended by the Practice of all Ages, as that which consists in a Jingle of Words, and is comprehended under the general Name of Punning. It is indeed impossible to kill a Weed, which the Soil has a natural Disposition to produce. The Seeds of Punning are in the Minds of all Men, and tho' they may be subdued by Reason, Reflection, and good Sense, they will be very apt to shoot up in the greatest Genius, that is not broken and cultivated by the Rules of Art.[9]

Of course, when Addison spoke of a genius not cultivated by the rules of art, he was referring to Shakespeare. Further on, Addison said of Shakespeare's plays: "... nothing is more usual than to see a Hero weeping and quibbling for a dozen Lines together."[10] The most famous condemnation in the eighteenth century of Shakespeare's use of puns, however, belongs to Samuel Johnson:

> A quibble is to Shakespeare, what luminous vapours are to the traveller; he follows it at all adventures, it is sure to lead him out of his way, and sure to engulf him in the mire. It has some malignant power over his mind, and its fascinations are irresistible. Whatever be the dignity or profundity of his disquisition, whether he be enlarging knowledge or exalting affection, whether he be amusing attention with incidents, or enchaining it in suspense, let but a quibble spring up before him, and he leaves his work unfinished. A quibble is the golden apple for which he will always turn aside from his career, or stoop from his elevation. A quibble, poor and barren as it is, gave him such delight, that he was content to purchase it, by the sacrifice of reason, propriety and truth. A quibble was to him the fatal Cleopatra for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it.[11]

With the two most influential critics in the eighteenth century so strongly condemning Shakespeare's frequent use of puns, it is no wonder that both adapters and editors were likely to tone down or eliminate them.

Just as eighteenth-century critics objected to Shakespeare's use of puns because puns were considered to be low forms of wit, they also objected to many common words that Shakespeare used because they felt that they were too common and hence unsuitable for the dignity of the stage. Many of these alterations may sound ridiculous today, but they were taken perfectly seriously in the eighteenth century. John Dennis, for example, felt it his duty to replace the phrase "so much sweat" with "so much toil" in his adaptation of Coriolanus, the word "sweat" being too indecorous for eighteenth-century ears; and Garrick, in his version of Romeo and Juliet, felt compelled to change the line:

> O what a beast was I to chide at him!
>
> to
>
> O what a wretch was I to chide him so?

and also Shakespeare's

> And with this knife I'll help it presently.
>
> to
>
> And with this steel I'll help it presently.[12]

These alterations are interesting and amusing for their own sakes, but they assume a much greater significance when we realize that some of them actually found their way into the scholarly editions of the time. A good example of this sort of thing is given by Branum:

> Hamlet ... provided some interesting alterations toward a more elevated diction. Davenant had printed, in his 1676 alteration of Hamlet, "To groan and sweat under a weary life" in place of Shakespeare's "To grunt...". This alteration was transmitted in the acting copies of the play and, more surprisingly, in the scholarly editions as well. Pope, Theobald, and Johnson all printed it "groan",

> Johnson adding: "All the old copies have to grunt and sweat. It is undoubtedly the true reading, but can scarcely be borne by modern ears."[13]

Johnson's comment here is of the utmost importance when we consider the mentality that motivated these editors in their respective tasks. Even Johnson, who certainly does not have the reputation that Pope and Warburton have for making gratuitous changes, felt perfectly justified in including a reading that he knew departed from Shakespeare's text, simply because he believed Shakespeare's wording was indecorous. When we consider the so-called "mangling" of Shakespeare's text that went on during the eighteenth century, we must remember this attitude towards Shakespeare's language. The type of intellectual society that one encounters during the eighteenth century might perhaps best be described as "self-satisfied." Both writers and critics believed that they were living in a new golden age, an age where proper knowledge of the rules of art led to a style which, when properly executed, was vastly superior to the "barbarous utterings" of the Elizabethans, including Shakespeare. As I said earlier, Shakespeare was greatly admired during the eighteenth century, but he was admired as a natural genius, who could "snatch a grace beyond the reach of art."[14] Addison, in Spectator #160, made this distinction most clear:

> Among great Genius's, those few draw the Admiration of all the World upon them, and stand up as the Prodigies of Mankind, who by the meer Strength of natural Parts, and without any Assistance of Art or Learning, have produced Works that were the Delight of their own Times and the Wonder of Posterity. There appears something nobly wild and extravagant in these great natural Genius's, that is infinitely more beautiful than all the Turn and Polishing of what the French call a Bel Esprit, by which they express a Genius refined by Conversation,

> Reflection, and the Reading of the most polite authors.[15]

In making this distinction Addison was merely restating a prominent critical theory. The usual comparison in the Restoration and the eightennth century was between Shakespeare, the poet of nature, and Ben Jonson, the poet of art. This distinction was perhaps first made in John Milton's L'Allegro, where he spoke of "Jonson's learned sock" in contrast to Shakespeare's "native wood-notes wild." The distinction proved a very useful tool for both Shakespeare's admirers and detractors, for, as Emerson R. Marks points out, "The usual tack was to ascribe [Shakespeare's] psychological depth and emotive power to a native gift while blaming his stylistic excesses and lapses of decorum on his supposed ignorance of the poet's craft."[16] When we consider some of the more outlandish alterations that were made in Shakespeare's text we must keep in mind the fact that while Shakespeare's works were admired during the eighteenth century, his language generally was not. James R. Sutherland, commenting on the eighteenth-century's attitude towards Shakespeare, correctly assesses the problem when he says:

> They admired his character drawing, his treatment of the passions, his rough majestic force, but rarely his language. Gray certainly did; but in this, as in some other things, he was an exception. The general opinion was that Shakespeare had the misfortune to live in a semi-barbarous age before the language had been sufficiently refined. He was a rude old artist, blundering occasionally into great thoughts, but never to be trusted, and frequently, in his irregularities and wild expressions, to be deplored.... Shakespeare was his own worst enemy; he had to be polished and put in order if he was to appeal to a politer age.... The fact is that Shakespeare succeeded in pleasing the eighteenth century in spite of his language.[17]

Sutherland is certainly correct if we consider only the first half of the eighteenth century, but he overstates his case here. In fact, Gray is not really an exception in his admiration of Shakespeare's language. In the last half of the eighteenth century, many earlier critical attitudes were revised, and critics such as the Warton brothers and Richard Hurd actually began to regard the old ideas of Augustan correctness as being inferior to the qualities of sublimity, sentiment, and passion that they felt were expressed in the works of Spencer and Milton, and which reached their ultimate expression in Shakespeare's plays. In his History of English Poetry, Thomas Warton attributed Shakespeare's superiority to other dramatists partially to the fact that he was writing at a time favorable to the production of "original and true poetry," and that in an enlightened age, it was almost impossible to be a true poet. As Warton said, "ignorance and superstition, so opposite to the real interests of society, are the parents of imagination .... we have parted with extravagancies that are above propriety, with incredibilities that are more acceptable than truth, and with fictions that are more valuable than reality."[18] In Joseph Warton's poem The Enthusiast; or, the Lover of Nature, it is possible for the poet to ask:

> What are the lays of artful Addison,
> Coldly correct, to Shakespeare's Warblings wild?[19]

Perhaps Emerson R. Marks best summarizes this whole attitude towards Shakespeare's language in the later half of the eighteenth century when he says: "In a critical atmosphere permeated by the belief that imaginative creation sorted ill with social refinement, it was inevitable that the alleged rudeness of Elizabethan times once used to explain Shakespeare's failings should be invoked in warrant of his poetic power."[20]

This new attitude towards Shakespeare's language and the new respect afforded to "primitive" cultures, especially to the Elizabethan, had an important effect on the editing of Shakespeare. Many critics now believed that, in order to understand a writer's work, one had to possess a knowledge of the society in which the writer was working. Pope had earlier accused Lewis Theobald of mere pedantry in his reading of "all such reading as was never read," but now Thomas Warton in a postscript to his Observations showed how Theobald was able to explain correctly a phrase in Troilus and Cressida which Pope had misinterpreted, by a reference to an old history of Troy known in Elizabethan times. It was now essential for any editor of Shakespeare to possess as much information as possible about all the circumstances surrounding Shakespeare's writing; and this included a thorough knowledge of Elizabethan society, of the type of theatres in which the plays were presented, and of the specific sources of each play. As Marks points out, "Gone was the attitude that had derided the historical philology of a Richard Bentley as a dull and useless form of antiquarianism. In the second volume of his critique of Pope, Thomas' brother Joseph made a point of hailing the 'victory over a whole army of wits' Bentley had gained by his Dissertation on the Letters of Phalaris (1697)."[21] This increased respect for intimate detail can be found in several of the later eighteenth-century editions of Shakespeare, and perhaps culminated in the editions of Capell and Malone.

To see just how far the technique of Shakespearean editing advanced during the eighteenth century it is essential to consider briefly the general precepts behind all of the editions. Certainly much of what will be said in the remainder of this chapter is standard knowledge, and

I make no claim to be breaking any new ground; however, this information must be fresh in our minds when we come to a consideration of the fundamental claim that is being advanced in this study; i.e., that a consistent and valuable technique of editing Shakespeare did emerge during the eighteenth century.

First of all, one must remember that the early editors of Shakespeare were working under overwhelming difficulties, and perhaps some of the damning criticisms that have been made against them are somewhat unfair. Rowe, for example, approaching the text of Shakespeare as it stood in 1709, must have felt extremely bewildered. Textual scholarship was virtually non-existent, and there was little idea of how the various folios and quartos related to one another. Likely the only knowledge that the early editors of Shakespeare's text possessed about the early quartos came from the rough lists in Gerard Langbaine's _Account of the English Dramatic Poets_ (1691), and his _Lives and Characters of the English Dramatic Poets_ (1699). In these two books only nine plays are mentioned as being in quarto form, including _The Tempest_, _Macbeth_, and _Julius Caesar_. However, all of the dates, with the exception of that for _Titus Andronicus_ (1594), were from the late seventeenth century. Given this state of complete chaos, it is not surprising that Rowe based his edition on the Fourth Folio. It was the most convenient work for Rowe to use, and it was only natural for him to feel that by using the Fourth Folio he would benefit from the labours of others, and possibly would avoid many of the early corruptions of the text.

Yet even if the early editors had possessed a more complete understanding of the intricate relationship between the folios and quartos, it is doubtful that such information would have been of much value to them.

In this age when we have such free access to nearly all of the early Shakespearean documents that we might require, it is difficult to conceive of even contemplating beginning an edition of Shakespeare without access to them; yet this was the situation confronting the early eighteenth-century editors. McKerrow points out that in the May 5, 1722, edition of The Evening Post, Jacob Tonson was, in view of Pope's forthcoming edition, advertising for editions of The Tempest, Macbeth, Julius Caesar, Timon of Athens, King John and Henry VIII printed before 1620.[22] Allardyce Nicoll raises the even more astonishing point that in 1726, when Lewis Theobald issued his extremely important Shakespeare Restored, he had not been able to see, far less procure, a copy of the First Folio.[23] Obviously, knowledge of the bibliography of Shakespeare's plays was, at best, vague.

Coupled with this lack of knowledge about Shakespeare's early texts was a very scanty knowledge of the works of any of Shakespeare's contemporaries, or indeed even of the type of English that Shakespeare and his fellow Elizabethans wrote and spoke. Alexander Pope, writing to his friend Francis Atterbury for advice about some parts of Shakespeare, received the following reply:

> The hardest part of Chaucer is more intelligible to me than some of these scenes, not merely through the faults of the edition, but the obscurity of the writer, for obscure he is, and a little (not a little) inclined now and then to bombast, whatever apology you may have contrived on that head for him. There are allusions in him to a hundred things of which I know nothing and can guess nothing. I protest Aeschylus does not want a comment to me more than he does. So that I despair of doing you any considerable service.[24]

Atterbury was certainly not an uneducated man, and his comments can be taken as representative of how the vast majority of Englishmen viewed

Shakespeare at the beginning of the eighteenth century. His greatness was recognized, but the difficulties with his language and allusions were so overwhelming that reading him was becoming more and more of a chore. Coupled with this was the fact that apart from the bulky folio editions of Shakespeare's complete works, and the scattering of quarto editions of individual plays, copies of Shakespeare's plays simply were not available. Clearly it was time for a new edition of Shakespeare that would fulfill the needs of the early eighteenth-century reading public.

It is pleasant to think that Jacob Tonson was primarily motivated by altruistic feelings in bringing out a new edition of Shakespeare in 1709, but the truth probably is that it was simply good business for him to do so. McKerrow points out that Tonson had earlier purchased the rights to the folio Shakespeare from the publishers of the Fourth Folio, and that, given the amount of piratical printing and agitation about copyright that was prevalent around this time, Tonson considered it prudent to call attention to his rights.[25] From the small remuneration that Rowe received for his efforts, it seems likely that Tonson did not expect any elaborate work to be done on the text.[26] The edition was intended as a popular one, and the low price of thirty shillings for all six volumes shows that Tonson anticipated a large sale.

Whatever Tonson's expectations, there can be little doubt that his choice of Nicholas Rowe as Shakespeare's first eighteenth-century editor was a fortunate one. Rowe was a man of the theater, through and through, and therefore was admirably suited to the task of presenting Shakespeare to the reading public. For ten years previous to his work on Shakespeare, Rowe had been involved in writing for the stage, and although he might have been relatively ignorant of the technical duties of an editor there were few who would be more adept at the popularization of Shakespeare.

Indeed, Rowe's own career as a playwright shows that he did not completely share the dislike of Shakespeare's language that was so prevalent during this time. In his Tragedy of Jane Shore, first acted in 1714, Rowe proclaimed that the play was "Written in Imitation of Shakespeare's Style," and although many critics, both eighteenth-century and modern, have scoffed at this claim,[27] Rowe had an understanding of the niceties of Shakespeare's language that outdid that of many of his contemporaries. Alexander Pope, for example, complained privately to Joseph Spence that "it was mighty simple in Rowe, to write a play now, professedly in Shakespeare's style, that is, professedly in the style of a bad age."[28]

Such a comment suggests that Pope was far less able than Rowe to appreciate the beauties of Shakespeare's language. Rowe's preface to his edition of Shakespeare reveals that his critical beliefs were influenced by John Dryden, and the central thrust of the preface seems to be that Shakespeare, although neglecting, or rather not knowing, the classical rules, was able by his natural genius to rise above these rules. The beauty of Shakespeare's language, as Rowe saw it, lay in his ability to raise the passions, and it was this aspect that Rowe was attempting to copy in Jane Shore. As he said in his prologue to the play:

> By no quaint rules nor hampering
> critics taught;
> With rough, majestic force he [Shakespeare]
> moved the heart,
> And strength and nature made amends for art.
> Our humble author does his steps pursue;
> He owns he had the mighty bard in view.
> And in these scenes has made it more his care
> To rouse the passions than to charm the ear.[29]

James Sutherland has convincingly shown that in Jane Shore one finds many echoes and parodies of Shakespeare's language, and also that Rowe occasionally had the ability to catch the rhythm of Shakespeare's blank verse.[30] Such a talent for the use and appreciation of Shakespeare's language could only prove to be beneficial to Rowe in his task of editing Shakespeare's works. Someone who respected Shakespeare's language would not be prone to making gratuitous changes, and in fact Rowe was one of the most conservative of the early eighteenth-century editors.

Let us now consider what Rowe professed to do in his edition of Shakespeare, and what he actually did. In his dedication to the Duke of Somerset Rowe clearly stated his claims. He admitted first of all that his work was not perfect, in that he had not been able to restore the text to the exactness of the original manuscripts, which were lost. He then made a rather grand claim:

> ... there was nothing left, but to compare the several Editions, and give the true Reading as well as I could from thence. This I have endeavour'd to do pretty carefully, and render'd very many Places Intelligible, that were not so before.[31]

Just how carefully Rowe compared the several editions remains to be seen, but it is significant that he at least had an idea of what he should be doing. Rowe was the first editor of Shakespeare who attempted to return to the original editions for correct readings, rather than simply to rely on his own instinct of what Shakespeare "meant" to say.

Rowe then pointed out that in some of the earlier editions, especially the last (the Fourth Folio of 1685), many lines were omitted, and that a whole scene was left out of Hamlet. He claimed to have supplied all of these omissions. He then concluded by saying that errors would certainly be found in his edition, but that he hoped most of these would be attributable to simple errors of the press.

As previously mentioned, Rowe used the Folio of 1685 as the basis of his edition, no doubt wishing to avail himself of the modernizations, emendations, and corrections of misprints that had been made by earlier editors. Of course, what Rowe failed to realize was that numerous new misprints and useless emendations had also been introduced and that the First Folio was the only folio that could have any real textual authority. Rowe also printed the seven plays that were first added in the Third Folio, and which, except for Pericles, were later to be rejected.

Rowe must, however, be given credit for attempting to clarify a great many unclear readings that are found in the Fourth Folio. As Samuel Johnson said, "without the pomp of notes or the boasts of criticism, many passages are happily restored."[32] Certainly many of the emendations that Rowe made were purely results of his invention, but it is unfair to say with Professor Lounsbury that "the emendations he made of the text came rarely, if ever, from the consultation of any original authorities."[33] Indeed, it is nearly impossible to determine the extent to which Rowe used the early texts. W.W. Greg points out that such esteemed critics of Shakespeare's text as David Nichol Smith and R.B. McKerrow could not come to an agreement on this point. Nichol Smith says: "In the play of Henry V there are more than twenty passages where he has restored the reading of the First or Second Folio; and there are other passages in this play where he gives the reading not of a Folio, but of a Quarto. In King Lear his use of one of the Quartos is unquestionable."[34] McKerrow, on the other hand, states that there is only one instance in Rowe's handling of Henry V that definitely suggests that a quarto was used, and that even in this instance the correction that Rowe made may have been nothing but a lucky guess.[35] Greg, however, presents a strong case for the fact that Rowe made at least some use of the First Folio:

> There can ... be no doubt of the use of F1,
> for there are half a dozen agreements in

> passages in which there is nothing evidently wrong with the reading of F4, and two or three in which the emendation is by no means obvious. In Lear there are two readings that conclusively prove the use of a quarto (probably Q3, 1655), namely 'launcht' for 'latch'd' at II.i.54, and 'coyning' for 'crying' at IV.vi.83. Launch, in the sense of pierce, seems to have been already obsolete in Rowe's time, and 'coyning' is surely past guessing.... These readings moreover are supported by others less striking.[36]

Hamlet is the only play that Rowe mentioned specifically in his preface in regard to his editorial duties, and it appears that he generally carried out what he claimed to do. Probably he collated a rather late quarto version of Hamlet, perhaps that of 1676, with the version given in the Fourth Folio, and, as McKerrow points out, he restored around one hundred and thirty one lines of the approximately two hundred and thirty one that were omitted in the Fourth Folio.[37] In so doing he restored fifty nine lines of Act IV, scene iv, of which the folios only printed eight lines. Presumably this is the scene that Rowe claimed that the folios omitted completely. Of the approximately one hundred lines that Rowe failed to restore, it is likely that some were purposely omitted because they were offensive to eighteenth-century notions of decorum. For example, Rowe probably felt that the lines on the drunkenness of the Danes (I.iv.17-38) and forty one lines of Hamlet's speech to Osric (V.ii.109-150) were better omitted.[38] Likely some of the other passages that Rowe omitted were merely overlooked.

It also appears that Rowe had access to one of the quarto editions of Romeo and Juliet, since he printed a prologue to that play that is not found in the folios. However, the fact that he printed the prologue at the end of the play rather than at the beginning seems to indicate that the quarto came into his possession while the edition was being printed, and hence was not useful to him in his emendation of the text.

Earlier it was mentioned that the adaptations of Shakespeare's plays occasionally played an important role in their editing, and McKerrow points out a very interesting example of this happening in Rowe's edition.[39] Rowe evidently printed a song which occurs in D'Avenant's 1674 adaptation of Macbeth, but which does not occur in any of the folios. Significantly, this song remained a part of the text of Macbeth in all subsequent eighteenth-century editions of the play, until it was finally excluded by Capell.

Although an exhaustive study of Rowe's emendations would not be practical, some consideration of his work on Shakespeare's text is essential. Ernest Walder points out that most of Rowe's alterations consisted either of the modernization of spelling, the correction of punctuation, or the correction of obvious misprints. Rowe modernized words like "moe" to "more," "windring" to "winding,"[40] "I'le" to "I'll," "sware" to "swear," and "toyl" to "toil."[41] His alteration of punctuation is summarized by Jackson:

> He eliminates almost entirely the predominant use of the colon (also the brackets. It may be noted that Rowe never refers to a footnote), substituting semi-colons or full stops; he employs the apostrophe and extends the Folio's scanty use of exclamation and interrogation marks. Now and again passages, previously difficult to explain, become quite clear when Rowe's punctuation is adopted. (e.g. "a fire with me the kings son" corrected to "a-fire with me; the king's son" - Tempest).[42]

Walder also gives some interesting examples of Rowe's remedying of misprints.[43] Although a number of Rowe's purely conjectural emendations are unfortunate, these emendations are mercifully few, and some of his more important conjectures have been permanently established. As Jackson points out, we owe to Rowe such readings as "Some are born great" for "some are become great" and "temple-haunting martlet" for "temple-haunting Bartlet."[44]

Of course, Rowe made many errors in his edition, some of which are mentioned by Jackson:

> Rowe's textual emendations sometimes betray a grave lack of insight, for example (as noted in the Cambridge Shakespeare), the "impotant letters" of the First Folio which became "impoteant letters" in F2 and "impotent letters" in F3 and F4 became "all-potent letters" in his edition (Comedy of Errors, V.i.138); he left "cursing like a very drab, a stallion" (Hamlet, II.ii) and "waited like a sea" (Corio, II.ii). Difficult words like "asprey" and "quat" were left in without alteration simply because he had nothing to substitute, not because he thought them correct; he omitted many words in order to render the lines smoother, whilst he often ran two separate lines into one. (e.g. Cymb. IV.ii.113; Antony & Cleo. IV.ix.19). Act IV, Sc.iii, in Lear, between Kent and a Gentleman, is entirely absent in Rowe's edition owing to its preservation only in the Quartos.[45]

I think it is fair to say, however, that these defects are greatly outweighed by the numerous improvements that Rowe made in the text.

Perhaps more important than his work on the text, however, is the work that Rowe did in providing lists of Dramatis Personae for all of Shakespeare's plays, in clarifying and adding many stage directions, in listing the localities of many scenes where before no locations were given, and in dividing many of the plays into acts and scenes. Some might argue that these labours amounted to nothing more than needless embellishments which would have been included by Shakespeare had he felt them to be necessary. However, this is to forget Rowe's primary purpose.

He intended to popularize Shakespeare; to make reading Shakespeare a less difficult task. Rowe's embellishments to Shakespeare's plays were details to which the eighteenth-century reader had grown accustomed, and there can be no doubt that reading Shakespeare in Rowe's edition was a much more pleasant task than attempting to read the stark Fourth Folio. Indeed, even today most readers would fervently object to having to read Shakespeare without Rowe's improvements.

These aspects of Rowe's work are well documented,[46] and it is hardly necessary to say much about them. First of all, Rowe attempted to regularize the naming of characters throughout Shakespeare's text. For example, he frequently substituted the names of characters for the impersonal designations often found in the earlier copies. One example that McKerrow gives of this technique is in The Comedy of Errors, where Aegeon is frequently referred to as 'Merchant of Syracuse,' 'Merchant,' 'Merchant Father,' or simply 'Father.' Rowe made him Aegeon throughout.[47] Obviously in regularizing Shakespeare's use of names Rowe took a large step in making the text less confusing to the ordinary reader.

The list of Dramatis Personae that Rowe included before each play also did much to make Shakespeare's play more accessible. Previous to his edition, no quartos and only seven plays among the folios had such lists. Rowe's lists still form the basis of our lists of Dramatis Personae today, although a certain amount of amplification has taken place.

In his work on the stage directions Rowe was mainly concerned with clearly indicating the entrances and exits of characters, although he did clarify many existing stage directions and added new ones where he thought them necessary. Wagenknecht tells us that in the scene where

Hamlet first sees his father's ghost, Rowe added the explanatory directions "Holding Hamlet," "Breaking from them," and "Writing;" and in Romeo and Juliet, in the scene of their last interview, Rowe changed Shakespeare's "Enter Romeo and Juliet aloft" to "Enter Romeo and Juliet above at a window; a Ladder of Ropes set."[48] Perhaps some, if not most, of Rowe's embellishments of and additions to Shakespeare's stage directions were not really necessary for an understanding of the plays, but certainly they clarified and made vivid a great deal of Shakespeare's more complex action. A large amount of Rowe's work in these areas remains part of Shakespeare's text today.

Although Rowe was rather inconsistent in indicating the localities of scenes,[49] he at least showed the way for later editors. No indications of localities were given in any of the quartos, and, as McKerrow points out,[50] the only two that occur in the folios are the setting of The Tempest, "an un-inhabited Island," and that of Measure for Measure, "Vienna." Rowe added general localities for the other plays and, in the tragedies at least, the localities of some specific scenes. However, as McKerrow says:

> He did not, ... as modern editors do, indicate the place of action at the head of every scene, but only where he regarded it as changing. Thus even at the beginning of an act no locality is given it if is supposed to be the same as that of the last scene of the previous act - a system which is a little confusing until one understands it.[51]

Although Rowe's work on scene localities has been greatly improved by later editors, the work that he did represents a valuable start. Many eighteenth-century readers would find Shakespeare's scenes much easier to visualize when a specific locality was given, and hence much of Shakespeare's dialogue which must have seemed very abstract when not centered in a particular place would now take on new life. As McKerrow says:

> ... it is undoubtedly true that many readers find it far easier to appreciate dialogue if they can place the characters somewhere. Without a locality they cannot see them, and if they are not seen their conversation carries no conviction. It is indeed likely to produce as little impression and to be as tedious to follow as many of us find a broadcast of a play which we have not previously seen on the stage. No doubt, then, the addition of localities begun by Rowe assisted in the popularity of Shakespeare's plays by making them more generally readable.[52]

Rowe's work on the division of plays into acts and scenes was also rather erratic.[53] His work in this regard on the comedies and histories is almost non-existent,[54] but he did do a great deal of work on the tragedies, where he made scene divisions, albeit occasionally rather erratically, in all of the plays. Again it must be said that although Rowe handled an important task in a rather scattered and incomplete manner, he did lead the way for later editors, and did do much in making Shakespeare's text more appealing to the general reader.

Two other editions of Rowe's Shakespeare were to appear, one likely in 1710 and the other in 1714, and while some new emendations appear, neither edition shows evidence of much careful and systematic revision. McKerrow believes that the third edition might have been entirely the work of John Hughes, the poet, editor of Spenser.

It should be mentioned before leaving Rowe that the "Life of Shakespeare" which precedes his edition was the first real life of the poet, and it is to Rowe's account that we owe our knowledge of many details about Shakespeare's life. This "Life," with slight revisions by Pope, was published throughout the whole of the eighteenth century, and, although many of Rowe's claims have been discounted by modern scholars, the "Life" remains an interesting and valuable document.

The next editor of Shakespeare was Alexander Pope, and although a full chapter will later be devoted to his edition, a few words are necessary here.

Pope was a natural choice for Tonson to make as an editor of Shakespeare. He was universally regarded as the foremost poet of the age, and what better man could be found to edit the work of the greatest English writer of all time? Although details of the inception of Pope's edition are rather sketchy, it seems that he began work shortly after his translation of The Iliad was completed (1720), and that most of his work on the text of Shakespeare was completed by 1723. The actual edition was not published until 1725 because Pope had problems writing the preface to it.

It appears from his preface that Pope had a good idea of his editorial duties, even if he did not always carry out his task. After providing a rather sketchy outline of the state of the text at this time, Pope discussed what he considered to be the duties of an editor:

> In what I have done I have rather given a proof of my willingness and desire, than of my ability, to do him [Shakespeare] justice. I have discharg'd the dull duty of an Editor, to my best judgment, with more labour than I expect thanks, with a religious abhorrence of all Innovation, and without any indulgence to my private sense or conjecture. The method taken in this Edition will show itself. The various Readings are fairly put in the margin, so that everyone may compare 'em; and those I have prefer'd into the Text are constantly ex fide Codicum, upon authority. The Alterations or Additions which Shakespeare himself made, are taken notice of as they

> occur. Some suspected passages which are excessively bad, (and which seem Interpolations by being so inserted that one can intirely omit them without any chasm, or deficience in the context) are degraded to the bottom of the page; with an Asterisk referring to the places of their insertion. The Scenes are mark'd so distinctly that every removal of place is specify'd; which is more necessary in this Author than any other, since he shifts them more frequently; and sometimes without attending to this particular, the reader would have met with obscurities. The more obsolete or unusual words are explained. Some of the most shining passages are distinguish'd by commas in the margin; and where the beauty lay not in particulars but in the whole, a star is prefix'd to the scene.[56]

Unfortunately, the difference between what Pope professed to do and what he actually did is great.

Perhaps the most telling phrase of the preface occurs when Pope spoke of his task as "the dull duty of an editor." Pope considered himself to be, and certainly was, a man of "spirit, taste and sense," and he took pride in contrasting himself to men like Theobald, who through "pains, reading, and study" were little more than pedants.[57] The textual problems that an editor must deal with required a great deal of what Pope would have considered very dull work, and in many cases he was just not interested enough to fulfill his task properly. He was much more interested in pointing out what he considered to be the beauties of Shakespeare's text, and for some his system of commas and stars is the most interesting part of his edition.

Unlike Rowe, Pope had a strong dislike for the language of the Elizabethans, so rather than attempt to elucidate the meanings of obsolete words and phrases, he often simply substituted a new word into the text. Coinciding with his dislike for much of Shakespeare's language, Pope also felt that many complete passages in Shakespeare simply did not come up to the high standard required by the more sophisticated eighteenth century. James Sutherland is accurate when he characterizes Pope's attitude as follows: "The editor's business is to display his author in the best possible light, and if his imperfections can be covered or removed or explained away, so much the better."[58] Such an attitude led to Pope's relegating of whole passages, obviously written by Shakespeare, to the bottom of the page. Pope could not stand the thought of Shakespeare bringing dishonour upon himself.

Pope's feeling that Shakespeare needed a guiding hand in order to be acceptable to the eighteenth-century reading public got him into trouble in several other ways. For example, often when Pope found Shakespeare's meter to be defective, he had no compunction about quite blatantly changing, adding, or leaving out words so as to have the meter conform to his own taste. Such action must have been almost irresistible to Pope, the greatest poet of the age, but it was certainly not the sort of thing that a serious editor of Shakespeare should have been doing.

Pope also changed many common words that Shakespeare used in order to have him conform to a greater extent to eighteenth-century notions of decorum. Some of these alterations seem absolutely ridiculous to us today, but nevertheless Pope considered this to be an important part of his task as editor. One example cited by McKerrow[59] is that whenever the word "hats" occurred in Coriolanus Pope changed it to something else, feeling that such a word simply had no place in a classical play. It is for such changes that Malone dubbed Pope, along with the editor of the Second Folio, as one of "the two great corrupters of our poet's text."

It cannot be said, however, that Pope made no improvements to Rowe's text. First of all, Pope completed many of the mechanical improvements to the text that were merely begun by Rowe. In his edition, Pope kept Rowe's lists of Dramatis Personae more or less intact, but he completed the designation of localities for the various scenes, a task which Rowe had only concerned himself with in the later plays. He also completed Rowe's work of dividing all of the plays into scenes, although he employed a rather peculiar method of doing so. It had been the Italian and French custom to begin a new scene each time a character of importance entered or left the stage, and Pope attempted to adopt this technique for Shakespeare's plays. The results were, to say the least, interesting. For example, in King Lear, where Rowe had eighteen scenes and most modern editors have twenty six, Pope had sixty.[60] A final mechanical improvement is that Pope omitted the seven spurious plays (including Pericles) which had been first introduced in the Third Folio and which were present in both the Fourth Folio and in Rowe's edition.

One must also give Pope some credit for his handling of the text. Pope was the first editor of Shakespeare who really made a concerted effort to obtain as many early quarto editions as possible, and, even though his use of these early editions was rather erratic, he still made much greater use of them than any previous editor. This aspect of Pope's edition will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Pope, then, might perhaps be considered as someone who was simply unsuitable for the task that he had undertaken. The next editor, Lewis Theobald, was the exact opposite of Pope in almost every way.

Theobald, in contrast to Pope, thought highly of the art of "verbal criticism," and because of this he was really the first critical editor of Shakespeare who understood his true duty. Hugh Dick calls

Theobald's preface to his edition of Shakespeare "the first significant statement of a scholar's editorial duties and methods in handling an English classic."[61] Theobald outlined his task as follows:

> The Science of Criticism, as far as it affects an Editor, seems to be reduced to these three classes; the Emendation of corrupt Passages; the explanation of obscure and difficult ones; and an Inquiry into the Beauties and Defects of Composition.[62]

As James Sutherland points out,[63] Theobald was listing these editorial duties in their order of importance, and by doing so he showed himself to be completely opposed to Pope's ideas. Sutherland is quite right in asserting that in all likelihood Pope did not regard Theobald as a superior editor to himself,[64] since his conception of the true duties of an editor was so different from Theobald's. However, at this point in the history of Shakespeare's text a true scholar, and not necessarily a man of genius, was required; and Theobald was nothing if not a scholar.

Although J.C. Collins might be overstating his case when he says of Theobald, "To speak of any of the eighteenth-century editors in the same breath with him is absurd,"[65] he certainly did contribute a sizable amount to the understanding of Shakespeare's text. McKerrow contends that Theobald's most important claim to fame is the fact that he was the "first to point out the value of comparing other passages of Shakespeare with those which it is sought to emend,"[66] and that "In his Shakespeare Restored and his edition of the plays he constantly supports his emendations by parallel passages, a method which has, of course, been followed by every commentator on Shakespeare since his day."[67] The reason that Theobald was able to point to parallel passages not only in Shakespeare but also in the works of many dramatists which Shakespeare may have read is that he systematically and completely immersed himself in the literature of Shakespeare's period, especially works with which Shakespeare might have been familiar. Theobald claimed to have read more than eight hundred English plays in preparation for his edition of Shakespeare, and while this claim might be somewhat of an exaggeration, there can be no doubt that his extensive knowledge of Elizabethan and early drama served him well.

Theobald was also qualified to edit Shakespeare for other reasons. Richard Foster Jones points out that one of Theobald's major qualifications as an editor was that he possessed an intimate knowledge of Shakespeare's style and diction, and that he had a true appreciation of the type of language that Shakespeare used.[68] Unlike Pope, who, as we have seen, felt that Shakespeare's language was one of his weak points, Theobald had a great appreciation of its beauties. As Jones points out, Theobald made the following comment about Shakespeare's language in Julius Caesar:

> As to particular Irregularities, it is not to be expected that a Genius like Shakespear's should be judg'd by the Laws of Aristotle, and the other Prescribers to the Stage; it will be sufficient to fix a character of Excellence to his Performances, if there are in them a Number of beautiful Incidents, true and exquisite Turns of Nature and Passion, fine and delicate Sentiments, uncommon Images, and great Boldness of expression.[69]

Such an attitude made Theobald a much more suitable person to edit Shakespeare than the typical eighteenth-century man, including Pope. Jones also points out that Theobald showed an unusual knowledge of Shakespeare's style by the type of phraseology that he used in The Cave of Poverty and in his adaptation of Richard II.[70]

What Jones refers to as "the first truly critical work on Shakespeare,"[71] Theobald's Shakespeare Restored, appeared in March, 1726 approximately one year after the publication of Pope's edition. The intent of this little work is self-evident from its full title: Shakespeare Restored: or a Specimen of the Many Errors, as well committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope In his Late Edition of this Poet. Designed Not only to correct the said Edition, but to restore the True Reading of Shakespeare in all the Editions ever yet publish'd. It would appear from this title that Theobald meant to devote approximately equal time to discussing all of Shakespeare's plays, but in reality the book devotes one hundred and thirty two pages of its one hundred and ninety four primarily to a discussion of Hamlet. In the final sixty two pages of the work, designated as an Appendix by Theobald, most of Shakespeare's plays received some study; however, a number of plays were only commented upon once. The only plays that Theobald did not mention at all are The Two Gentleman of Verona, As You Like It, and Twelfth Night.

Theobald really divided his Shakespeare Restored into three parts, since the Appendix has two main divisions. In the first part, Theobald was able to concentrate his attack on Pope even more strongly, since he directly attacked Pope under the following subjects: emendation where there is no need of it; maiming the author by unadvised degradations; bad choice in various readings and degradation of the better word; and mistakes in giving the meaning of words. In this section Theobald also attacked Pope's punctuation and the inaccuracies of his edition that were due to inattention to Shakespeare and his history. The remainder of the Appendix, pages one hundred and sixty four to the end, is devoted entirely to emendations.

?

McKerrow points out an interesting fact about Theobald's corrections to Hamlet in Shakespeare Restored.[72] Although he made about one hundred and six alterations to Pope's text, twenty two of which were either improvements in Pope's punctuation or corrections of obvious misprints, of the remaining eighty four corrections, fifty one were readings from editions other than those followed by Pope, and thirty three were Theobald's own conjectures. Using the Aldis Wright 'Cambridge' edition as an example of a modern conservative edition, McKerrow notes that while forty five of the fifty one readings that Theobald acquired from other texts have been adopted, only three of Theobald's own conjectures are included in the modern edition. As McKerrow says, "Clearly so far as Hamlet is concerned the influence of Theobald was far more in the number of almost certainly correct readings which he recovered from the earlier editions than in his own conjectural emendations."[73]

As pointed out in the first chapter, it is one of the great ironies of the history of editing Shakespeare in the eighteenth century that even after each of the respective editors criticized his immediate predecessor in as strong and virulent terms imaginable, he invariably relied on that editor's edition as the basis of his own. Amazing as it may seem, Theobald used Pope's edition as copy-text for his Shakespeare, which was made available to the public in 1733.

His adoption of Pope's edition as the basis of his own greatly lessens the importance of Theobald's edition. Theobald introduced a large number of important readings from other editions, but unfortunately he also allowed many of Pope's inferior readings to remain, even when superior readings were available. An even more serious error, and one that seems absolutely astonishing to us today, is that Theobald often allowed Pope's metrical variations to remain in his text, even though he was well aware of the peculiarities of Shakespeare's verse, and had strongly chastised Pope for attempting to make it conform to eighteenth-century standards. Thomas R. Lounsbury points out[74] that Theobald not only occasionally followed Pope in printing as verse those passages originally intended as prose (and vice versa), but he also followed Pope in four other types of alteration which affected Shakespeare's meter. First, there was the addition of an extra word or words to a line; second, the omission of a word or words from a line; third, the transposition of words in a line; and fourth, the contraction of two words into one, or a corresponding expansion. Even more serious than these types of changes was Pope's habit of substituting a word of his own for one of Shakespeare's. Not only were these changes intended to alter Shakespeare's meter, but, as we have already seen, they were also used to correct supposed errors in grammar or composition, and were even used with the intent of purposely altering Shakespeare's meaning.

Given the principles underlying Theobald's edition, it is difficult to see how he could follow Pope in these alterations, but follow him he did. Lounsbury points out that in Measure for Measure Pope made one hundred and forty seven such emendations, of which Theobald accepted ninety four and only discarded fifty three.[75] Why Theobald did this is not clear. Perhaps, as McKerrow suggests,[76] Theobald carefully collated only those plays in which he was interested, while referring to other editions of less interesting plays only when something struck him as being definitely wrong. However, we cannot discount Martin Beller's assertion that "... Theobald, despite his sensitivity to the nuances of Shakespeare's language, and despite his attempts to understand the principles of Shakespeare's grammar, rather than to set him to school with the eighteenth century, was often unable to accept the latitude Shakespeare allowed his characters in the use of language."[77] Like so many editors in the eighteenth century, Theobald may have understood the duties of the textual editor, but even he was constitutionally incapable of fully carrying them out.

Of course, all of this is not to say that Theobald's edition does not represent a great improvement in many ways over Pope's. Theobald devoted a great deal of energy to such things as discovering Shakespeare's sources, the proper chronology of the plays, and the authenticity of Shakespeare's authorship of some of the more doubtful plays. In the first regard, perhaps Theobald's most important discovery was the fact that Shakespeare often carefully followed Holinshed's Chronicle, and this discovery occasionally enabled Theobald to make very astute emendations. Theobald was also aware of Shakespeare's knowledge of certain Italian stories and the Lives of Plutarch, and pointed out possible sources for Shakespeare's King Lear, Hamlet, and Troilus and Cressida.[78] As far as the dating of Shakespeare's plays is concerned, Theobald did not attempt to date any of the plays exactly, but rather, by relying on historical evidence and on his knowledge of Elizabethan drama, he attempted to place the plays in approximate chronological order. Although his dating was occasionally rather erratic, he did come reasonably close in a number of cases.[79] When it came to examining doubtful plays for evidence ofShakespeare's authorship, Theobald was in his element. Because of his knowledge of both Elizabethan history and literature, as well as his sensitivity to and knowledge of Elizabethan English, Theobald was able to apply both external and aesthetic tests to doubtful plays, and his conclusions are difficult to dispute. Although he followed Pope in omitting Pericles from his edition, he was convinced that Shakespeare had a part in its composition. He also felt that in both Titus Andronicus and the three parts of Henry VI, Shakespeare was not the sole author, and perhaps had only retouched the plays. His belief that Shakespeare may have had a part in the composition of The Two Noble Kinsmen runs parallel with the opinions of a number of modern scholars.

Theobald's wide reading in the literature of Shakespeare's age also held him in good stead when it came to explaining the meaning of obscure words or passages in Shakespeare's text. There are well over two hundred such explanatory notes in Theobald's edition, where the editor, either through his knowledge of the peculiarities of Shakespeare's diction, or through reference to parallel passages, or perhaps to Shakespeare's sources or knowledge of history, was able to clear up an obscurity. By using his wide knowledge Theobald was also able to restore or defend a number of variant readings which Pope had either emended or discarded for an inferior reading. As Jones points out,[80] in over two hundred instances Theobald restored words or passages either omitted or emended by Pope. R.B. McKerrow contends that Theobald's footnotes form the most important aspect of his edition, and actually serve to initiate the critical study of Shakespeare's language.[81]

A second edition of Theobald's Shakespeare appeared in 1740, but, since the edition contains mainly conjectural emendations with no evidence of fresh or new collation, it is of minor importance. However, a later edition, appearing in 1757, will figure in our discussion of Johnson's text.

The next editor of Shakespeare's works was Thomas Hanmer. Hanmer differed from previous editors in that for him the editing of Shakespeare was purely an act of love. A former Speaker of the House of Commons, Hanmer spent much of his later life in scholarly retirement at his seat of Mildenhall near Newmarket, and one of his chief interests during this time was his work on Shakespeare's text. Hanmer described the origin of his edition in his preface:

> One of the great Admirers of this incomparable Author hath made it the amusement of his leisure hours for many years past to look over his writings with a careful eye, to note the obscurities and absurdities introduced into the text, and according to the best of his judgment to restore the genuine sense and purity of it. In this he proposed nothing to himself but his private satisfaction in making his own copy as perfect as he could: but as the emendations multiplied upon his hands, other Gentlemen equally fond of the Author desired to see them, and some were so kind as to give their assistance by communicating their observations and conjectures upon difficult passages which had occurred to them. Thus by degrees the work growing more considerable than was at first expected, they who had the opportunity of looking into it, too partial perhaps in their judgment, thought it worth being made public.[82]

Hanmer might best be described as a cultured amateur in the ranks of Shakespearean editors. It was his aim to make Shakespeare as appealing as possible to the eighteenth-century readers; and to do so he spared no pains in making his edition physically attractive. Even today Hanmer's edition is regarded as one of the greatest productions of the Oxford Printing House, and its appeal to an eighteenth-century reader must have been immense. The typography is handsome; and the edition contains thirty six fine plates which were designed by Hagman at a cost of £3,3s for each design. The total production cost was a little over £1,200, which included £800 for paper, £305 for press-work, £52,10s for collations, and even two guineas for the press-men "to drink Sir Thomas Hanmer's health."[83] There were at least six hundred copies of the edition produced, since five hundred and seventy five sets were sold at three guineas apiece in 1744-5, six more in 1745-6, and the last three in 1746-7.[84] The low selling price of the edition shows that Hanmer certainly had no aspirations to accumulate material wealth through his labours.

Unfortunately, though, despite the pleasing physical appearance of the edition, one can clearly see that although Hanmer had some idea of what the task of an editor should be, he was too greatly influenced by the editing techniques of Alexander Pope to produce anything of much value. One is falsely encouraged when Hanmer says:

> ... that as the corruptions are more numerous and of a grosser kind than can well be conceived but by those who have looked nearly into them; so in the correcting them this rule hath been most strictly observed, not to give a loose to fancy, or indulge a licentious spirit of criticism, as if it were fit for anyone to presume to judge what Shakespeare ought to have written, instead of endeavouring to discover truly and retrieve what he did write.[85]

However, hopes are quickly dashed when Hanmer goes on to say in the same paragraph that the only alterations that were made were those necessary either to clarify the sense of the passage, or to regularize the meter.

In the next paragraph one realizes just how much Hanmer was influenced by Pope's edition, as he actually praises Pope for relegating certain passages to the bottom of the page, and even goes so far as to regret that more passages did not meet with a similar fate. He assures the reader, however, that "a great deal ... of that low stuff which disgraces the works of this great Author, [and which] was foisted in by the Players after his death, to please the vulgar audiences by which they subsisted"[86] would not be left in the text of his own edition. Hanmer, then, attempted to "improve" on what are possibly the most objectionable features of Pope's edition.

Hanmer printed his edition from Pope's, but also used Theobald for many textual emendations. Thus while Hanmer followed Pope in omitting or degrading to the bottom of the page many of Shakespeare's lines, he often followed Theobald in the reading of a word or phrase. Perhaps the most annoying feature of Hanmer's edition, however, is that he never acknowledged the fact that he was following the reading of a previous editor or of Warburton, and hence many omissions, additions and emendations that were not original had, until fairly recent times, been credited to him. Samuel Johnson's assessment of this feature of Hanmer's edition cannot be improved upon:

> ... by inserting his emendations, whether invented or borrowed, into the page, without any notice of varying copies, he has appropriated the labour of his predecessors, and made his own edition of little authority. His confidence indeed, both in himself and others, was too great; he supposes all to be right that was done by Pope and Theobald; he seems not to suspect a critick of fallibility, and it was but reasonable that he should claim what he so liberally granted.[87]

On the whole, then, Hanmer's edition of Shakespeare must be regarded as a step backwards. Some of his emendations were clever, but the fact that damns him is that he reverted to a technique of editing that had rightly been rejected by Theobald. However, Shakespeare's next editor, William Warburton, does not represent much of an improvement.

If for no other reason, Warburton has become famous (or infamous) as the most arrogant and obnoxious editor of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century. His quarrels with Theobald and Hanmer are well known, and there are few accounts of these quarrels in which Warburton does not seem to be largely at fault. Yet the conceit of the man enabled him to lash out at all previous editors (with the exception of Pope, in whose friendship he took great pride),[88] and his belittling and condescending remarks towards these previous editors in his preface make it one of the most obnoxious documents of the whole period. For example, Warburton summarily dismissed the editorial work of both Theobald and Hanmer with the following curt sentence: "To conclude with them in a word, They separately possessed those two Qualities which, more than any other, have contributed to bring the Art of Criticism into disrepute, Dulness of Apprehension, and Extravagance of Conjecture."[89] Such a comment might be partially justified if applied exclusively to Hanmer, but to say such a thing about Theobald, whom many consider to be the real father of Shakespearean textual criticism, is unforgivable.

The fact that Warburton actually printed his own edition from Theobald's shows that he did not hold the edition in as much contempt as one might suppose. Certainly it was common practice for an editor to print his own edition from one that he had previously criticized in the strongest terms imaginable, but in Warburton's case one feels that he should have printed his edition from Pope's, since in his title page he led the reader to believe that the edition was the result of a collaboration between himself and Pope. However, the truth of the matter is that Warburton took little from Pope except his scene numbering.

The worst fault of Warburton's edition is that in many cases he blatantly altered Shakespeare's text where there was absolutely no need for doing so. The reason for this is not clear. Perhaps he felt that by altering so many of Shakespeare's lines he was displaying his own erudition and cleverness to an ignorant public; or perhaps, as Martin Beller suggests, Warburton was driven by "his desire to demonstrate that Shakespeare's writings were a repository of wisdom and truth, theologically sound, and morally unobnoxious,"[90] and that this desire outweighed any textual considerations. However, whatever the reason, Nichol Smith is certainly accurate when he says that "[Warburton's] work is disfigured by licence of conjecture, and he provided the example of what must not be done. No subsequent editor was to take so great liberties."[91]

The same sort of problem arises with Warburton's notes. Even though he occasionally was able to clear up obscure and difficult passages, in many cases he went to great lengths to explain passages where no explanation was necessary, and more times than not his explanations only served to complicate the issue at hand. As Samuel Johnson said, "His notes exhibit sometimes perverse interpretations, and sometimes improbable conjectures; he at one time gives the author more profundity of meaning, than the sentence admits, and at another discovers absurdities, where the sense is plain to every other reader."[92]

On the whole, then, Warburton's edition cannot be considered a success. There is no doubt that Warburton was a clever man, but he was also a vain, arrogant and petulant individual who seemed to have little idea of the real task of a Shakespearean editor. The next editor, Samuel Johnson, is extremely important in that he was the first to enunciate fully the real task of the editor; but unfortunately, as we shall see, he was not always successful in putting his theories into practice.

In 1745, Johnson published Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth: with remarks on Sir Thomas Hanmer's Edition of Shakespeare, with a Specimen. However, in typical Johnsonian fashion, the publication of the edition was not to come about for twenty years. When we look at Johnson's activity during this time, it is easy to see why. First of all, it was during this period that Johnson undertook his massive Dictionary of the English Language which was published in 1755 after eight years of what must have been the most grueling sort of labour imaginable. As if this was not enough, from 1750 to 1752 Johnson produced his Rambler essays (208 in number), then the Adventurer essays, and finally his Idler essays. In 1759 he also wrote his famous Rasselas, which, as he later told Reynolds, was composed in the evenings of the final week of his mother's life, in mid-January, and was written, at least in part, to defray the costs of his mother's funeral. It is impossible to know just how much time Johnson was able to devote to Shakespeare during this period, but it is obvious that he did not neglect the bard completely. In 1741 Johnson composed the Prologue which was spoken by David Garrick at the opening of the Drury Lane Theatre, and which said much in praise of Shakespeare's art. In 1751 Johnson dedicated two of his Rambler essays (numbers 156 and 168) to a discussion of Shakespeare, and in 1753 wrote the dedication for his friend, Charlotte Lennox, to her Shakespeare Illustrated. Obviously, then, Johnson had Shakespeare in the back of his mind all through this period, and many of the notions expressed in these works were later to reoccur in refined form in his Preface of 1765.

In 1756, Johnson issued a new set of Proposals for the printing of his Shakespeare by subscription, and incredibly, he made it one of the conditions of the Proposals that the complete edition was to be published by Christmas of 1757. Obviously, Johnson greatly underestimated the magnitude of the task that he had set for himself. The completed edition was not to appear for another nine years.

The 1756 Proposals are interesting primarily for one reason. In them Johnson attempted to define the sources of corruption in Shakespeare's text:

> They were immediately copied for the actors, and multiplied by transcript after transcript, vitiated by the blunders of the penmen, or changed by the affectation of the player; perhaps enlarged to introduce a jest, or mutilated to shorten the representation; and printed at last without the concurrence of the author, without the consent of the proprietor, from compilations made by chance or by stealth out of the separate parts written for the theatre, and thus thrust into the world surreptitiously and hastily, they suffered another deprivation from the ignorance and negligence of the printers, as every man who knows the state of the press in that age, will readily conceive.[93]

Johnson has been the target of a great deal of criticism for this statement, and it has been often rather unfairly quoted as being representative of his textual ideas for the edition itself.[94] A fairer assessment of the statement, however, has been made by Robert E. Scholes. Scholes contends that Johnson's statement, rather than representing a definite theory of principle upon which he based his own edition, should be seen as "a rather uncritical acceptance of the theories advanced primarily by Pope and Theobald."[95] Johnson learned through the actual process of working on his edition, and a number of the comments found in the notes and preface to the edition show that Johnson changed and refined many of his ideas during his nine years' labour.

The prevailing note that one finds in the preface is one of restraint. In contrast to several previous editors, Johnson was not about to justify any wild emendations by the supposed complete corruption of the text. He still felt that the text was corrupt, but the reasons he now supplied to account for the corruption are much sounder than those given in the Proposals.

> The faults are more than could have happened without the concurrence of many causes. The style of Shakespeare was in itself ungrammatical, perplexed and obscure; his works were transcribed for the players by those who may be supposed to have seldom understood them; they were transmitted by copiers equally unskilful, who still multiplied errours; they were perhaps sometimes mutilated by the actors, for the sake of shortening the speeches; and were at last printed without correction of the press.[96]

As Robert E. Scholes points out, "The principal change from the corresponding sentence in the Proposals is the omission of the suggestion that the actors may have added material, and the doubtful - 'perhaps sometimes' - tone in which it is observed that they were responsible for shortening the plays."[97]

Further on in the preface, Johnson made it perfectly clear that he did not consider it the duty of an editor to rewrite Shakespeare, and perhaps for the first time the reader encounters a clear and concise explanation of what an editor really should be doing:

> Conjecture, though it be sometimes unavoidable, I have not wantonly nor licentiously indulged. It has been my settled principle, that the reading of the ancient books is probably true, and therefore is not to be disturbed for the sake of elegance, perspicuity, or mere improvement of the sense. For though much credit is not due to the fidelity, nor any to the judgment of the first publishers, yet they who had the copy before their eyes were more likely to read it right, than

> we who have read it only by imagination. But it is evident that they have often made strange mistakes by ignorance or negligence, and that therefore something may be properly attempted by criticism, keeping the middle way between presumption and timidity.
>
> Such criticism I have attempted to practise, and where any passage appeared inextricably perplexed, have endeavoured to discover how it may be recalled to sense, with least violence. But my first labor is, always to turn the old text on every side, and try if there be any interstice, through which light can find its way; nor would Heutius himself condemn me, as refusing the trouble of research, for the ambition of alteration. In this modest industry I have not been unsuccessful. I have rescued many lines from the violations of temerity, and secured many scenes from the inroads of correction. I have adopted the Roman sentiment, that it is more honorable to save a citizen, than to kill an enemy, and have been more careful to protect than attack.[98]

Even if Johnson did not carry out his plans as thoroughly as he might have, there can be no doubt that here, at last, we have an editor who was proceeding upon correct principles. The aim now was to reproduce what Shakespeare actually wrote, not what someone living two hundred years later thought he should have written.

One other important note in Johnson's preface is his comments on the four folios of Shakespeare. Johnson was certainly the first of the eighteenth-century editors who understood how Shakespeare's early texts had to be collated. He said in reference to Theobald:

> In his enumerations of editions, he mentions the two first folios as of high, and the third folio as of middle authority; but the truth is, that the first is equivalent to all others, and that the rest only deviate from it by the printer's negligence. Whoever has any of the folios has all, excepting those diversities which mere reiteration of editions will produce. I collated them all at the beginning, but afterwards used only the first.[99]

Obviously, this is exactly what modern textual critics believe, and one can only agree with McKerrow when he says: "If only some editors who followed him had pondered over the significance of his words, how much trouble they might have saved themselves and of how many superfluous footnotes would editions of Shakespeare have been relieved."[100]

Robert E. Scholes has also pointed out that in his notes Johnson displayed a great advance in editorial theory from the previous editors.[101] Throughout the text Johnson seldom made a major emendation without attempting to justify it by some sort of bibliographical theory. Frequently he spoke of the type of errors that scribes or printers might make in reading or copying, and by doing so he was at least approaching the type of textual criticism that we have today, where the habits of particular compositors are taken into consideration to account for the text. Perhaps even more interesting is the fact that in at least six cases where Johnson spoke of an error in reading or copying the text, he attributed this error to a peculiarity of Elizabethan handwriting. Of course, this sort of study forms an important part of modern editorial technique; and while Johnson certainly did not do much in the field, he was, with the possible exception of Theobald, the first editor to take any interest in it whatsoever.

Although Johnson never completely rejected the idea that some of the plays might have been printed from actors' piece-meal parts, he used the theory sparingly ("on three occasions in the first four volumes and not at all in the last four, suggesting that he may have been losing confidence in it").[102] In his handling of the quartos and folios, Johnson occasionally accepted Pope's idea that some of the poor quartos were merely rough drafts or "first-sketches," but in discussing the relationship between the quartos and the First Folio he maintained that the Folio text usually represented a revision, possibly by Shakespeare, of an earlier work. Because of this belief, he generally adhered to the reading of the Folio text, and would rarely use an alternate reading in a poor quarto to justify an emendation.

On the other hand, Johnson at times noticed that a Folio text followed a quarto text very closely. On this point, Scholes makes the following interesting comment:

> [Johnson] did observe that the First Folio text of Richard II was printed from the Quarto of 1615 and that it read on at least one occasion as a Quarto of 1598. He also saw that the Folio text of A Midsummer Night's Dream followed a Quarto very closely. Here, indeed, Johnson was on the threshold of modern bibliography, though it remained for Malone to perceive that what Johnson had observed of two plays was true of many others. Johnson, unfortunately, left us no bibliographical reasons for his observations on the printing history of these two plays. But his reasoning must have been sound, or his guesses extremely shrewd, for modern scholars have supported both his observations.[103]

Johnson's comments on the relationship between the Folio texts has already been commented upon. Obviously, then, Johnson did much in the way of pioneering modern techniques of textual criticism, and modern textual scholars would do well to remember his efforts. Unfortunately, though, Johnson's edition is much better from a theoretical standpoint than from a practical one, and his actual text leaves much to be desired.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty with Johnson's edition is that he used as his copy-text both Warburton's 1747 edition, and an edition of Theobald's Shakespeare which was published in 1757. By doing so, Johnson was committing the same error that was made by every eighteenth-century editor of Shakespeare up to the time of Capell, i.e., basing a text on one's immediate predecessor's edition rather than on early quartos and folios. However, in Johnson's case the problem is compounded since he seemed to be completely indiscriminate in his choice of copy-text, at times relying on Warburton for a specific play, and at other times relying on Theobald. What is even more disconcerting is that at times he relied on both of his predecessors for a specific play, again apparently without reason.[104] Of course, the inevitable result of such a practice was that many unnecessary errors crept into Johnson's edition, and the text became, on the whole, scarcely more reliable than those of his predecessors.

Another fault with Johnson's edition is that, as he himself admitted, he managed to acquire few of the early quartos,[105] and his collation even for those that he did acquire seems to have been rather haphazard. Arthur Eastman maintains[106] that the great merit of Johnson's text is that primarily through adjustments in punctuation, minor emendations in word choice and syntax, and additions of new stage directions, Johnson was able to make the meaning of the text much clearer to the eighteenth-century reading public. No doubt this is true, but really such a goal, or indeed such an achievement, says little about Johnson's performance as a textual critic, at least as we define the term today.

There can be no doubt that the primary merit of Johnson's edition, aside from the preface, resides in his clear and illuminating notes. Few critics have spoken with greater common sense than Johnson or been more successful in illuminating difficult passages or explaining obscure words.

As David Nichol Smith says:

> ... in the kind of notes which alone could be written if all the libraries in the world were burned, and we had nothing to guide us but our common sense and what we know of our fellow creatures and of the workings of the head and of the heart, Johnson is supreme. In all those passages where scholarship and historical knowledge fail to give us their aid there is still no more helpful guide than he. Once we know him we may be trusted to ask, when baffled by a difficult passage, "What does Johnson say?"[107]

Johnson's edition, then, might be seen as a rather curious mixture of success and failure. Certainly many of his theoretical principles were sound, and he must be given credit for pioneering many editorial techniques that have now become standard practice. There can be little doubt of the brilliance and clear-headedness of his preface and his notes, which still, after more than two hundred years, demand the utmost respect. However, textually speaking, Johnson's edition must ultimately be considered as a failure. By not collating early texts, by using Warburton's and Theobald's editions as copy-texts, and by introducing a number of gratuitous changes for the sake of "clarity," Johnson's edition loses much of its textual importance. However, the groundwork for a successful text had now been laid. More successful editions, by Capell and Malone, were almost inevitable.

Alice Walker has said that if Johnson can be considered as the last representative of the old school of Shakespearean editors, then Edward Capell must certainly be considered as the first of the new school of editors.[108] It is my belief that Capell was not only the first of the new school of editors, he was also the finest editor that the eighteenth century produced, and indeed he was one of the most influential of all of Shakespeare's editors. For this reason, I propose to devote a subsequent chapter to Capell, but some brief mention of his accomplishments is necessary at this point.

Capell's edition of Shakespeare was published in 1768. He mentioned in his introduction that printing had begun in September of 1760, and that eight of his ten volumes were in print by August of 1765. He therefore had little opportunity to make use of Johnson's edition, which he claimed to have looked "but slightly over." For reasons which will become apparent later on, it is not likely that he would have made extensive use of Johnson's edition, even if he had had the chance.

It is to Capell's credit that he managed to collect the largest number of Shakespeare's early quartos that had ever been brought together up to that time. However, unlike all of the previous editors who had merely collected early quartos and then had not known how to make proper use of them, Capell knew exactly how to use his early source material, and he also possessed the necessary perseverance to use all of his material to the fullest extent.

Perhaps Capell's greatest claim to fame is that he realized the essential error that all previous editors, including Johnson, had made in their editions of Shakespeare, and he broke away from this incorrect tradition. Capell's edition had been inspired by his anger over the efforts of Thomas Hanmer, who, as we have seen, did little more than take Pope's text and make a number of rather arbitrary alterations. Capell was the first of Shakespeare's editors who realized that any edition of Shakespeare which was simply based on the edition immediately previous to it was not going to be a success, but rather was only going to add further corruptions to the text. For his own edition Capell went back to Shakespeare's earliest texts, his quartos and the plays in the First Folio, and used as the basis of his edition those early texts which were closest to Shakespeare's own manuscript. In his introduction he lists the folios and quartos which he used in the preparation of his text, adding the word "best" beside each early text that he used as his copy-text. Such a theory of copy-text, of course, anticipates much modern textual theory, and it is to Capell's credit that he restored literally hundreds of substantive variants which had been lost during the history of the transmission of the text.

However, even though Capell used an early text as the basis for each of his plays, he was anything but a conservative editor. Because he subjected himself to the arduous process of collating all of the early texts, Capell knew that corruptions, whether deriving from compositors' errors or from other sources, were the rule rather than the exception. He also had no delusions about the strict authority of the plays printed in the First Folio. Capell argued that since the First Folio did not make a very good job of many of the texts for which the quartos are still extant, there is little reason to believe that it was any more faithful to the text of those plays of which the source is now lost.[5] Capell, then, was not afraid to make an emendation where he discovered corruption. However, Capell's method of emendation differs greatly from that of previous editors. Before Capell, many editors would emend purely on grounds of personal preference, with little or no textual theory to support their emendations. Capell's emendations, however, were based on a firm knowledge of the circumstances behind the transmission of the text, and also on a shrewd awareness of the relationship of different quartos to each other and also to the folio. Capell, then, actually anticipated a great deal of critical theory which is behind the eclectic method of editing texts which is so common today.

Capell's edition was followed in 1773 by a revised version of Johnson's Shakespeare, supervised by George Steevens. Steevens undoubtedly was one of the most qualified of all eighteenth-century editors. As early as February 1, 1766, he independently issued a Prospectus for his edition of Shakespeare, claiming that "A perfect edition of the Plays of Shakespeare requires at once the assistance of the Antiquary, the Historian, the Grammarian, and the Poet."[109] Obviously, then, Steevens was not approaching his task lightly. Also, his interest in Shakespeare's early texts is unmistakable. In 1766 he brought out an edition of twenty of Shakespeare's early quartos, certainly a very important and necessary step in the history of Shakespearean textual study. Despite all this, however, Steevens' reputation as a Shakespearean editor has never been high. Walder, for example, introduces his section on Steevens with the following curt remark: "It is by no means a pleasing transition from Capell to Steevens. We pass from love and refinement to haughtiness and vulgarity."[110] Walder proceeds to accuse Steevens of being "dishonest" and "bereft of all reverence for his author,"[111] and generally this attitude towards Steevens is still prevalent today. It is, I think, in some respects unfair to him. In the preface to his edition of 1773, Steevens clearly showed that the revelations of Capell had not passed him by unnoticed. We might perhaps criticize Steevens for pettiness in never speaking favourably of Capell, but the following extract from his preface shows that he was impressed by at least some of Capell's ideas:

> ... as every fresh editor continued to make the text of his predecessor the groundwork of his own (never collating but where diffi-

> culties occurred) some deviations from the originals had been handed down, the number of which are lessened in the impression before us, as it has been constantly compared with the most authentick copies, whether collation was absolutely necessary for the recovery of sense, or not.[112]

Steevens was certainly being unfair to some of his predecessors here by claiming that they only collated when it was absolutely necessary to do so, but it would seem that he did grasp Capell's point about the problems inherent in basing an edition of Shakespeare on that of one's predecessor. Also, as evidenced by his defence of Theobald's editorial methods, Steevens was well aware of the necessity of being familiar with all aspects of Elizabethan literature which might somehow aid the Shakespearean editor:

> ... these strange and ridiculous books which Theobald quoted, were unluckily the very books which Shakespeare himself had studied; the knowledge of which enabled that useful editor to explain so many different allusions and obsolete customs in his poet, which otherwise could never have been understood. ... If Shakespeare is worth reading, he is worth explaining; and the researches used for so valuable and elegant a purpose, merit the thanks of genius and candour, not the satire of prejudice and ignorance. That labour, which so essentially contributes to the service of true taste, deserves a more honourable repository than the Temple of Dulness.[113]

Indeed, it is in his ability to explain Shakespeare's text that Steevens took the most pride, and it is this aspect of his edition that continues to receive praise, even from his severest critics. Walder even manages to concede that "[Steevens] is at his best in explanatory notes on Shakespeare's language and allusions."[114]

Steevens also supervised an edition of Shakespeare which was published in 1773, and Issac Reed's 1785 edition was based on Steevens' text. It was not until 1793, however, that Steevens brought out an edition of Shakespeare which was completely his own, and it is in his preface to this edition that we can clearly see why his editorial labours have elicited so much adverse criticism. The problem with Steevens' editorial technique is not that he meant to be dishonest, and certainly not that he scamped his work; rather, he simply did not have enough faith in the old editions to adhere faithfully to their readings. His position is clearly summarized in the following paragraph from the 1793 preface:

> ... it is time, instead of a timid and servile adherence to ancient copies, when (offending against sense and metre) they furnish no real help, that a future editor, well acquainted with the phraseology of our author's age, should be at liberty to restore some apparent meaning to his corrupted lines, and a decent flow to his obstructed versification. The latter ... may be frequently effected by the expulsion of useless and supernumerary syllables, and an occasional supply of such as might fortuitously have been omitted, notwithstanding the declaration of Hemings and Condell, whose fraudulent preface asserts that they have published our author's plays "as absolute in their numbers as he conceived them." Till somewhat resembling the process above suggested be authorized, the publick will ask in vain for a commodious and pleasant text of Shakespeare. Nothing will be lost to the world on account of the measure recommended, there being folios and quartos enough remaining for the use of antiquarian or critical travellers, to whom a jolt over a rugged pavement may be more delectable than an easy passage over a smooth one, though they both conduct to the same object.[115]

Steevens' stand here does not seem unreasonable. In fact, it might be viewed as the culmination of one school of eighteenth-century editorial technique. As we have seen, all eighteenth-century editors made a point of commenting on the disgraceful state of the Folio and quarto texts, and yet all at least made a pretence of adhering to these texts wherever possible. Steevens was simply attempting to point out the absurdity of strictly adhering to texts that were universally recognized as being corrupt. Unfortunately, where his logic broke down was in the fact that he had no consistent system of selecting good readings from bad, and therefore he really was no farther ahead than Pope. Walder, in fact, says that "[Steevens] tampers with the text as much as Pope, lopping off and adding recklessly in order to produce smooth versification."[116] This may be true, but what is interesting to notice is that even Steevens' contemporaries realized that there was something fundamentally wrong with his editorial method. John Monck Mason's assessment of the 1785 edition is typical of the attitude of the times:

> ... [Steevens'] merit is more conspicuous in the comments than the text; in the regulation of which he seems to have acted rather from caprice, than any settled principle; admitting alterations, in some passages, on very insufficient authority, indeed, whilst in others he has retained the antient readings, though evidently corrupt, in preference to amendments as evidently just; and it frequently happens, that after pointing out to us the true reading, he adheres to that which he himself has proved to be false.... as it now stands, the last edition has no signal advantage, that I can perceive, over that of Johnson, in point of correctness.[117]

Steevens' editions, then, represent a necessary culmination of one school of eighteenth-century editorial philosophy. Steevens was the unashamed eclectic, and as such he articulated much of what editors from Pope to Johnson believed, but refused to admit. However, this is not to say that editorial philosophy had not advanced at all during this period. If Steevens' textual technique does not represent much of an advance over Pope's, the reaction of many eighteenth-century critics certainly shows a new sophistication; a sophistication primarily brought about by the revelations of Johnson, Capell and others.[118] Many critics now believed that one could come closest to Shakespeare's actual text only by respecting the earliest editions. As we shall see, this school of Shakespearean editorial philosophy was to find its champion in Edmund Malone.

In the Advertisement to the 1821 "Boswell's Malone" edition of Shakespeare, James Boswell said that "It was the object of Mr. Malone, from which he never deviated, to furnish the reader, as far as it was possible, with the author's unsophisticated text."[119] Indeed, this is a very accurate assessment of Malone's editorial philosophy. Malone was the arch conservative; in fact, in many ways he was more conservative than the strictest of twentieth-century editors.

David Nichol Smith has said that Malone "remains the greatest of all our Shakespearean scholars,"[120] and when we look at Malone's accomplishments it is difficult to argue with Smith's assessment. Malone's first major work of Shakespearean scholarship was his "Attempt to ascertain the Order in which the Plays attributed to Shakespeare were Written," which was printed in Steevens' 1778 edition. This essay is universally recognized as the first serious and systematic attempt to deal with this subject. Malone was well versed in all aspects of Elizabethan life and literature, and, through careful analysis of pertinent records, letters and literary works from Shakespeare's time, he was able to make some fascinating discoveries.[121]

Throughout his career as a Shakespearean scholar Malone was to contribute several other invaluable studies. His "Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage," which he included in his 1790 Shakespeare, is referred to by Smith as the "first authoritative treatise on early drama."[122] Malone was also the first of Shakespeare's editors to attempt a reworking of Rowe's "Life of Shakespeare." Throughout the eighteenth century, editors had merely reprinted Pope's revised version of Rowe's account, and never attempted any further research. Malone was the first to attempt what may be termed a "scholarly" biography of Shakespeare, based on the careful study of pertinent documents rather than on legend and hearsay. Malone's work on Shakespeare's language and verse was also invaluable. Even though editors like Theobald and Capell had taken considerable pains to become familiar with the type of English written by Shakespeare, Malone excelled all of his contemporaries in this most important area. Because of his superior knowledge of Shakespeare's language, many obscurities in the text were clarified and many rejected readings were restored. Malone's knowledge of Shakespeare's verse and language enabled him once and for all to prove the superiority of the First Folio to the Second, and to discount the claims made by Steevens as to the importance of the Second Folio. Obviously, then, Malone must be regarded as one of the most important and influential Shakespearean scholars of the eighteenth century, and indeed of any century.

Malone's own edition of Shakespeare appeared in 1790, after eight years of diligent preparation. It was, as I have said, the culmination of the conservative philosophy of editing which had been steadily growing throughout the century. Malone was greatly influenced in his editing techniques by Capell; and, because of Malone's much more straightforward and precise style of writing, he was to receive much more critical praise and attention than was afforded the earlier editor. As we shall see, Malone was even more conservative in his editorial philosophy than Capell, and in fact went a bit too far in his conservatism.

Malone's preface to his 1790 edition is a masterful exposition of the conservative philosophy of editing. He began by dispelling the persistent ideas about the corruption of Shakespeare's text which for so long had caused editors to take unjustifiable liberties. Malone stated categorically that Shakespeare's text is not nearly as corrupt as all editors up to Johnson had claimed:

> It is not true that the plays of this author were more incorrectly printed than those of any of his contemporaries: for in the plays of Marlowe, Marston, Fletcher, Massinger, and others, as many errors may be found. Nor is it true, in the latitude in which it is stated, that "these plays were printed from compilations made by chance or by stealth out of the separate parts written for the theatre:" two only of all his dramas, The Merry Wives of Windsor and King Henry V appear to have been thus thrust into the world, and of the former it is yet a doubt whether it is a first sketch or an imperfect copy.[123]

Having thus put aside the excuses that earlier editors had used to justify their many emendations, Malone defined what he considered to be the task of the Shakespearean editor. From what he said, it is clear just how far the science of editing had advanced during the eighteenth century:

> The principal writers of the early part of this century seem never to have looked behind them, and to have considered their own era and their own phraseology as the standard of perfection: hence, from the

> time of Pope's edition, for above twenty years, to alter Shakespeare's text and to restore it, were considered as synonymous terms. During the last thirty years our principal employment has been to restore, in the true sense of the word; to eject the arbitrary and capricious innovations made by our predecessors from ignorance of the phraseology and customs of the age in which Shakespeare lived.[124]

A clearer exposition of the advance made in Shakespearean editorial technique could not be wished for. In his explanation of the duty of the Shakespearean editor, Malone is equally clear and concise:

> As on the one hand our poet's text has been described as more corrupt than it really is, so on the other, the labour required to investigate fugitive allusions, to explain and justify obsolete phraseology by parallel passages from contemporary authors, and to form a genuine text by a faithful collation of the original copies, has not perhaps had that notice to which it is entitled: for undoubtedly it is a laborious and a difficult task: and the due execution of this it is, which can alone entitle an editor of Shakespeare to the favour of the publick.[125]

No modern editor would think of disagreeing with Malone's assessment.

Malone then went on to explain his own editorial techniques and, as we shall see, in many respects he simply elaborated on Capell's theories. Malone, like Capell, was very much concerned with the proper establishment of copy-text; indeed, he felt that an editor could do nothing at all until he had thoroughly investigated the relative merit of all of Shakespeare's early texts:

> ... though to explain and illustrate the writings of our poet is a principal duty of his editor, to ascertain his genuine text, to fix what is to be explained, is his first and immediate object: and till it be established which of the ancient copies is entitled to preference, we have no criterion by which the text can be ascertained.[126]

The first duty of the editor, then, must be to investigate the nature of Shakespeare's early quarto and folio texts. Malone began with a careful examination of the early quartos, and in his examination we again see many of Capell's ideas being echoed.

Malone rejected the notion that the early quartos were all "stolen and surreptitious," claiming that Heminge and Condell made this statement "merely ... to give an additional value to their own edition."[127] Rather, he believed that of the fifteen plays which were printed in quarto versions before the publication of the First Folio, only two, The Merry Wives of Windsor and King Henry V were completely corrupt; the others were extremely valuable, and in fact were generally preferable to the Folio texts. Malone reasoned as follows:

> ... instead of printing these plays from a manuscript, the editors of the folio, to save labour, or from some other motive, printed the greater part of them from the very copies which they represented as maimed and imperfect, and frequently from a late, instead of the earliest, edition; in some instances with additions and alterations of their own. Thus therefore the first folio, as far as respects the plays above enumerated, labours under the disadvantage of being at least a second, and in some cases a third, edition of these quartos.[128]

This is not to say, however, that Malone completely dismissed the importance of the Folio texts for plays which had previously been printed in quarto form. On the contrary, a careful line-by-line collation between these quartos and the First Folio is necessary. As Malone said:

> I do not, however, mean to say, that many valuable corrections of passages undoubtedly corrupt in the quartos are not found in the folio copy; or that a single line of these plays should be printed by a careful editor without a minute examination, and collation of both copies; but

> those quartos were in general the basis on which the folio editors built, and are entitled to our particular attention and examination as first editions.[129]

Malone's opinions in this regard were later to be substantiated by Pollard.

Earlier in this chapter we noticed that Capell was the first to realize the problems inherent in basing one's edition of Shakespeare on that of an immediate predecessor, and he continually stressed the importance of returning to the early quartos for authoritative readings. Malone carried this process even farther. He not only believed that "every ... edition is more or less correct, as it approached nearer to or is more distant from the first,"[130] he also maintained that the first quartos and the First Folio were the only editions that had any authority whatever. It is in this belief that Malone's conservatism went too far. As we shall see in chapter four, Capell, while realizing the tremendous importance of first quarto editions, also realized that later quartos could in fact provide authoritative readings, and hence also had to be carefully collated. Malone, however, expressed his feelings as follows:

> The various readings found in the different impressions of the quarto copies are frequently mentioned by the late editors: it is obvious from what has been already stated, that the first edition of each play is alone of any authority [as footnote: except Romeo and Juliet], and accordingly to no other have I paid any attention.[131]

Unfortunately, Malone's insistence on the worthlessness of the later quartos was generally accepted for over one hundred years. As stated previously, it is one of the great ironies of Shakespearean editorial history that someone who did as much as Malone to restore Shakespeare's text should have been responsible for over a century of wrong thinking about the nature of these later quartos.

Malone's achievement, however, cannot be underestimated because of this one error. He did clarify and expand many of Capell's essential ideas, and with his 1790 edition we have a very important culmination of the conservative philosophy of editing. Near the end of the preface Malone expressed the hope that "We shall never ... again be told, that 'as the best guesser was the best diviner, so he may be said in some measure to be the best editor of Shakespeare.'"[132] Because of the pioneering work of men such as Capell and Malone, such a hope was to become a reality.

Chapter III

Alexander Pope's Edition of Shakespeare

It is now necessary to consider individually two of the most important eighteenth-century editions of William Shakespeare's works. For this purpose, I have chosen the editions of Alexander Pope and Edward Capell. The choice of Capell can, I think, be easily justified. Today even the most prejudiced critic would have to consider his edition to be among the best of a poor lot. Less obvious is justification of Pope's work, the editor whom Malone grouped with the editor of the Second Folio as one of the worst corrupters of Shakespeare's text. However, even if Malone's assessment of Pope's work was valid, progress would be shown by comparing a poor early edition with a good later edition. However, I hope to show that many of the charges of incompetence that have been levelled against Pope are unfair. One point I have attempted to make throughout the first two chapters is that the motives of the respective editors must always be kept in mind when one evaluates their performances. This is not to say that we cannot condemn Pope's edition on some grounds. It is, by twentieth-century standards, a very poor work of scholarship. However, we must remember that Pope was not trying to conform to our standards. In his preface, Pope stated that "To judge ... of Shakespear by Aristotle's rules, is like trying a man by the Laws of one Country, who acted under those of another."[1] Pope here ironically anticipated the type of criticism that his performance as a Shakespearean editor was to receive. For some time, with some notable exceptions,[2] he has been judged by the laws of another country.

The standard complaint levelled against Pope as an editor of Shakespeare is that he simply was not constitutionally fitted to endure the drudgery necessary to produce a good edition. As pointed out in chapter two,[3] Pope considered himself to be a man of "spirit, taste, and sense," and as such he was not interested in the type of verbal criticism that had been recently exhibited by Theobald, Bentley, and the like. In fact, he considered this sort of criticism to be the dullest form of pedantry. Many critics have suggested that Pope's strong ridicule of the methods of the "verbal critics," and Theobald in particular, found in "The Dunciad," was merely the result of Pope's desire to take revenge on Theobald for Shakespeare Restored, and perhaps to vindicate what he knew was his poor performance as an editor by making his opponents look foolish. These indeed might partially have been Pope's motives, but Sutherland points out that from Pope's earliest days he harboured a strong resentment against the type of criticism epitomized so exactly by Theobald. At the age of twenty-seven, long before Pope ever considered becoming an editor himself, he wrote the following note:

> It is something strange that of all the Commentators upon Homer, there is hardly one whose principal Design is to illustrate the Poetical Beauties of the Author. They are voluminous in explaining those Sciences which he made but subservient to his Poetry, and sparing only upon that Art which constitutes his Character. This has been occasion'd by the Ostentation of Men who had more Reading than Taste, and were fonder of shewing their Vanity of Learning in all Kinds, than their Single understanding in Poetry. Hence it comes to pass that their Remarks are rather Philosophical, Historical, Geographical, Allegorical, or in short rather any thing than Critical and Poetical. Even the Grammarians, tho' their whole Business and Use be only to render the Words of an Author intelligible, are strangely touch'd with the

> Pride of doing something more than they ought. The grand Ambition of one sort of Scholars is to increase the Number of Various Lections; which they have done to such a degree of obscure Diligence, that we now begin to value the first Editions of Books as more correct, because they have been least corrected. The prevailing Passion of others is to discover New Meanings in an Author, whom they will cause to appear mysterious purely for the Vanity of being thought to unravel him.... For Reading is so much dearer to them than Sense, that they will discard it at any time to make way for Criticism ...[4]

Sutherland goes on to make the point that Pope never deviated from this attitude throughout the rest of his life:

> Commentators (he finds) persist in commenting upon everything except the poetry; they concentrate upon matters which are either irrelevant or of secondary importance; they have more learning than taste, and they make use of their reading to propose unnecessary corrections or to invent difficulties so that they may display their erudition.[5]

Given this attitude, then, it is little wonder that Pope did not present the eighteenth-century reading public with a "correct" edition of Shakespeare. Modern critics' obsession with restoring Shakespeare's original text probably would have seemed laughable to Pope. For him the beauty of Shakespeare's works lay in the poetry. Occasionally, of course, that poetry might have to be refined, since the taste of the age had changed (improved, Pope would say). However, to do so was a major part of the editor's task, as Pope saw it.

It is difficult to reconcile Pope's attitude to the text with what he said in his preface. Here, in a passage already quoted,[6] Pope claimed to have discharged his duty "with a religious abhorrence of all Innovation, and without any indulgence to my private sense or conjecture." Certainly

Pope was not quite accurately representing his actual procedure here. However, prefaces seem to be rather peculiar vehicles for a number of eighteenth-century editors. The reader no doubt has noticed that almost all of the editors enunciated fairly sound principles in their prefaces, and then ignored these principles in their actual editions. Why they did this can never be positively ascertained. The fact that the prefaces invariably were written after the actual edition was completed might be partially responsible for the apparent change of attitude. As we noticed with Johnson, one can learn something about editorial technique through the actual process of editing. Probably Pope, like Johnson, had a clear conception of what his duty was only after doing his job; and also, like Johnson, the thought of redoing any of the work which had been such drudgery for him was just too repellent even to be considered. However, this explanation might again be the result of viewing Pope from a twentieth-century perspective. Sutherland points out that if we try to view things from Pope's perspective, what he says in the preface becomes much less far-fetched:

> ... [Pope] could fairly claim that he was not using his "private sense, or conjecture"; he was usually emending what seemed to him, owing to his lack of familiarity with Elizabethan English, a manifest printer's error, the sort of error that Lintot's compositor might have made in setting up The Rape of the Lock. By the standards of the early eighteenth century Pope was a conservative editor; and he probably resisted the temptation to astonish the world with a conjectured emendation far more often than did Theobald.[7]

As stated previously, one of the most common rationalizations of Pope's "poor" performance as an editor is that he did not possess the necessary scholarly nature to carry out effectively the "dull duty" required of him. Lounsbury, certainly not one of Pope's strongest supporters, analyses Pope's character as follows:

> The scholastic instinct, sometimes present in poets of genius, was lacking in him entirely. He could never have applied himself, as did Ben Jonson, to the production of an English grammar. He could never have composed, as did Milton, a Latin one. He could never have interested himself, as did Gray, in writing notes upon Greek authors and compiling Greek chronological tables. So constituted, he had naturally failed to acquire the special qualifications which were requisite to carry through with success the work he had undertaken.[8]

Pope would have objected to this assessment of his character. Mere pedantry was never considered by Pope to be scholarship, but Lounsbury, it would seem, is being rather unfair to Pope by saying that he was not interested in anything even remotely resembling the work of the scholar. A much fairer assessment of Pope's interest in scholarly activities is provided by George Sherburn:

> ... [Pope] took a keener interest in antiquarian learning, especially of a literary sort, than he would have admitted to the Scriblerus Club. In later years he told Spence, 'I once got deep into Graevius, and was taken greatly with it: so far as to write a treatise in Latin, collected from the writings in Graevius on the Old Buildings in Rome.' Spence, who was more than an amateur in archaeology, respected Pope's knowledge. In the poet's early letters to Walsh, and especially in those to Cromwell, he had exhibited a considerable tendency towards bookishness, and he continued throughout his career an interest in the history of English poetry. He had revised the verses of Wycherley and other contemporary bards; he had edited the 'remains' of Betterton - modernizations of Chaucer - and in 1717-18 he became much interested in the Rev. Aaron Thomson's translation of Geoffrey of Monmouth. To this he made at least one small poetic

> contribution, and his interest in the translation was probably an early stimulus towards the project of his epic on the subject of Brutus.[9]

Pope, then, was not simply the creative genius, uninterested and repelled by any type of scholarship, that Lounsbury represents him as being. He possessed a type of scholastic nature, albeit perhaps the wrong type for an editor. Pope, however, would never have admitted to being unsuited for his task.

Pope's activities just prior to his work on the edition of Shakespeare provide a valuable clue to the spirit in which he approached his task. He had been involved for some six years with a translation of Homer's Iliad, and the critical success of this work no doubt enticed him to edit Shakespeare's plays. In a letter to Caryll written in October, 1722, Pope confessed that "I must again sincerely protest to you that I have wholly given over scribbling, at least anything of my own, but am become, by due gradation of dulness, from a poet, a translator, and from a translator, a mere editor."[10] Given Pope's connection with the Scriblerus club, it is doubtful that he was being completely sincere about his degradation, but one cannot doubt that during this period he was almost completely immersed in scholarly activities, at the expense of his own creative writing. During the period that he was working on his edition of Shakespeare, he was also involved in a translation of the Odyssey, plus editions of the writings of his two recently deceased friends, Parnell and the Duke of Buckingham. Clearly, Pope enjoyed doing this sort of work. As Sherburn says, "[Pope] came to feel somewhat injured if the works of deceased friends (Wycherley, for example) were not submitted to his care."[11] This sort of activity understandably had a distinct influence on some of the editing techniques that he employed in his work on Shakespeare's plays, and several critics have contended that he could not have prepared for his editing duties in a worse manner. David Nichol Smith, for example, has this to say about Pope's activities during this period:

> Literary executorship is the very worst preparation for an edition of a great English classic. The problems are entirely different. What has an executor to do with a series of papers that are not quite ready for the press? He is disloyal to the memory of his friend if he perpetuates the little blemishes which his friend would undoubtedly have removed; and if he hits on a happy little alteration which he is convinced his friend would have at once adopted, a rearrangement of words, or the omission of a clumsy or obscure phrase, he may not be the trusty friend that he was expected to be if he stays his hand. Now Shakespeare's papers had not been left ready for press, and the players who published them in 1623, and the subsequent editors or printer's readers, had scamped their work. Pope saw, as clearly as we do, that it was the duty of an editor to go back to the beginning.[12]

The picture that we see of Pope as he approached his task of editing Shakespeare is now becoming clearer. We see a man who has always been interested in so-called scholarly pursuits, and who takes special pleasure in revising and editing the works of friends and associates. We also see a man who has, throughout his life, fought against dullness and all types of what he considers to be pedantic criticism. The mixture, certainly, is a rather peculiar one, and the results of Pope's Shakespearean labours are, ultimately, not surprising.

As mentioned in chapter two, the details of the inception of Pope's edition of Shakespeare are not clear. The task of publishing his translation of the Iliad was completed in 1720, and one assumes that Pope could not have accomplished much work on his Shakespeare before this time. Sherburn points out that in a letter to Fenton, who was later to assist Pope in his work on Shakespeare, Pope made no mention of any work on the edition. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

> I am a little scandalized at your complaint that your time lies heavy on your hands, when the muses have put so many good materials into your head to employ them. As to your question, what I am doing, I answer, just what I have been doing some years - my duty; secondly, relieving myself with necessary amusements, or exercises, which shall serve me instead of physic as long as they can; thirdly, reading till I am tired; and lastly, writing when I have no other thing in the world to do or no friend to entertain in company.[13]

Obviously Pope had not asked Fenton to help him at this time, but this does not prove that Pope had not begun to work on the edition himself. A letter to Caryll, the date of which, as Sherburn points out, "must fall late in 1721, though dated 1722 by the editors,"[14] proves that the edition must have been underway before Buckingham's edition was proofread. In any event, Pope announced his intention to edit Shakespeare to the general public by advertising for early editions in the Evening Post (October 2, 1721), and by announcing in the Weekly Journal, or Saturday's Post (November 18) that "The celebrated Mr. Pope is preparing a correct Edition of Shakespear's Works; that of the late Mr. Rowe being very faulty."[15]

When Pope agreed to undertake his work on Shakespeare's text, he probably had little conception of the enormity of the task. As we have seen, Pope took great pleasure in certain types of scholarly pursuits, and he probably thought that editing Shakespeare's works would involve little more work than editing the works of his friends Parnell and Buckingham. Furthermore, the critical acclaim that Pope received from his translation of the Iliad had been immense. As Lounsbury points out, "[Pope] was hailed on all sides as the British Homer."[16] Pope was never one to shrink from praise, and he probably saw an even greater opportunity for fame through editing Shakespeare. Jacob Tonson II, ever the crafty businessman, saw the glory that Pope's translation of the Iliad had brought to the house of Lintot, and he quickly determined that he was not going to be outdone. Lounsbury describes the situation as follows:

> After the death of Addison, in 1719, there was no one to dispute [Pope's] place at the head of English men of letters. His only possible rival was exiled to Ireland. Furthermore, Swift, though far superior as a writer of prose, was in the highest form of literature no rival at all. It struck Tonson as the most desirable of speculations that the greatest of English dramatists should be edited by the greatest of living English poets. It was an enterprise which would bring credit to his house as well as money to his purse. Accordingly, he made the necessary overtures. Pope listened to the voice of the charmer. In an evil hour for his comfort and reputation he agreed to undertake the task.[17]

Pope, then, was to a certain extent seduced by the smooth-talking Tonson to undertake the task of editing Shakespeare, but another definite factor in his decision was that he saw an opportunity of making a fairly substantial amount of money, without taking any risk. Pope's translation of the Iliad had repaid him handsomely, but throughout his life Pope had a desperate fear of ever having to bow down to a patron, or having to ask for any sort of financial favour. Who can forget Pope's devastating portrait of Bufo, the patron, in the "Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot:"

> Proud as Apollo on his forked hill,
> Sate full-blown Bufo, puff'd by ev'ry quill;
> Fed with soft Dedication all day long,
> Horace and he went hand and hand in song.
> His Library, (where Busts of Poets dead

> And a true Pindar stood without a head)
> Receiv'd of Wits an undistinguish'd race,
> Who first his Judgment ask'd, and then a Place:
> Much they extoll'd his Pictures, much his Seat,
> And flatter'd ev'ry day, and some days eat:
> Till grown more frugal in his riper days,
> He pay'd some Bards with Port, and some with Praise,
> To some a dry Rehearsal was assign'd,
> And others (harder still) he pay'd in kind.
> Dryden alone (what wonder?) came not nigh,
> Dryden alone escap'd this judging eye:
> But still the Great have kindness in reserve,
> He help'd to bury whom he help'd to starve.[18]

Given the fact that taxes on Roman Catholics were steadily increasing, it is not surprising that Pope, the businessman, would jump at the opportunity of increasing his wealth. Geoffrey Tillotson analyses Pope's situation during this time as follows:

> In between the earlier and the later writing come Pope's translations of Homer and the edition of Shakespeare's plays: The interval was deemed necessary for financial reasons. Pope's Catholic religion ruled out party writing, and he did not care to accept bribe and pension. The only way left, therefore, was that of making money by writing 'pure' literature; and, against hard conditions, which were of recent growth and so all the harder, he gained a competence on the scale that allowed him to live the life he wanted to.[19]

Ironically, however, the actual amount that Pope received from Tonson, £217,12s, seems to be rather small. Lounsbury, in fact, says that "The amount indeed is so beggarly as to be suspicious."[20] The suspicion arises from the fact that Pope vehemently claimed that he never received any profits from the subscription, but received only a flat rate from Tonson. This claim is suspect if for no other reason than Pope's excessive protestations about it. As Lounsbury says, "Pope's veracity is never so much to be suspected as when he is found resenting any attack upon his character or exhibiting peculiar sensitiveness to any imputations cast upon his honour."[21] Sherburn, as well, is suspicious of Pope's claim and cites a letter from Tonson to Pope from which it is possible to surmise that Tonson had tried to persuade Pope not to advertise that he had not received any profit from the subscription.[22] Whatever the case, there can be little doubt that money, as well as the desire for more prestige, played a large part in Pope's decision to edit Shakespeare's works.

Once Pope had made his decision, he approached his task logically and systematically. Critics who have accused Pope of shirking his task, and doing only a half-hearted job, are being most unfair to him. As pointed out in chapter two,[23] Pope was the first of Shakespeare's editors to make a concerted effort to obtain as many early quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays as possible, and indeed his final collection of early editions is quite remarkable. Pope lists a quarto edition for every one of Shakespeare's plays for which a quarto exists, except Much Ado About Nothing, and there is ample evidence that he made use of all these texts in his collation.[24] Furthermore, Pope lists copies of the First and Second Folios as being used for collation, and Sherburn points out that Pope also probably possessed a copy of the Third Folio.[25] Such a large collection of early editions was not to be rivalled until Capell's edition in 1767. Pope's use of these early editions will be discussed somewhat later on in this chapter, but no one can deny that he did go to some considerable effort to obtain the source material necessary to produce a good edition.

Pope's method of collating the various early editions of Shakespeare's works has struck many critics as being rather peculiar. In a letter to Tonson, written in the spring of 1722, Pope provides some idea of how he went about his task:

> ... my affairs have hurried me to and from London, interchangeably every day; the last part of the planting season taking me up here, and business which I think less agreeable, there. I'm resolved to pass the next whole week in London, purposely to get together parties of my acquaintance every night, to collate the several editions of Shakespeare's single plays - five of which [whom?] I have engaged to this design.[26]

From this, and from letters to Fenton and Broome,[27] it would seem that Pope's method of collation was to bring several friends together, and, while one read from a specific edition of a single play, the others would note the variations found in other editions of that play. The accuracy of such a method of collating is rather difficult to determine. Sherburn calls Pope's method "amusingly informal and unscientific,"[28] but John Butt points out that "Malone was of the opinion that it was the only sure method of comparing texts, and a friend once told me that he had also tried it and thereby corrected what he had fondly supposed was an accurate collation."[29] For reasons which will become clear later on in this chapter, I believe that Pope's method of collation was much more accurate than most critics are willing to admit.

It was not just in collating the text, however, that Pope employed several friends as helpers. Apparently, he divided the various other necessary tasks amongst a number of his friends. The exact distribution of labour is now, of course, impossible to determine, but from figures in Tonson's account books we can judge that the work of some of his assistants must have been fairly substantial. Sherburn points out that "for helping Pope Fenton received £30,14s, and Gay received £35,17s6d. From a letter to Tonson [3 September (1721)] we learn that Fenton received £25 in addition to this payment entered in Tonson's account books, and it becomes apparent that ₤35 were paid, as Pope requested, to 'a man or two here at Oxford to ease me of part of the drudgery of Shakespeare.'"[30] When one considers that each of Pope's assistants received almost as much for his labours as Rowe did for his whole edition (₤36,10s.), one begins to suspect that their contributions to the edition must have been fairly extensive.[31]

After a rather elaborate advertising campaign, and after several calls for new subscribers by Tonson,[32] Pope's edition of Shakespeare's works was published on March 12, 1725. The sale of the edition, as Sherburn points out, was quite good:

> Ultimately 411 subscribers took 417 copies of the six volumes. According to Dr. Johnson 750 sets were printed, and of those 140 remained unsold in 1767 when they brought only 16s. each instead of five guineas. These statements (if authentic) hardly indicate the low regard for Pope's editing that Johnson asserts; they rather indicate a preference for the octavo and duodecimo editions which followed the quarto during the years 1728-35.[33]

Probably one of the main reasons for preferring the smaller volumes was that they were somewhat less expensive. Although Pope was never popular with most of the critics of the time, the majority of the initial criticism was directed against the high cost of the edition, rather than against Pope's performance as an editor. Tonson, then, was the first target of the critics' scorn. There was a great deal of resentment over Tonson's claim of having a perpetual copyright on the works of Shakespeare, and many justifiably felt that if Tonson's claim was to be accepted, he had a duty to provide the public with a good edition at a reasonable price.[34]

It was really not until after the publication of Theobald's Shakespeare Restored (March, 1726) that critics started vehemently to attack Pope's performance as an editor. The reason for this delay seems clear. Pope was, as stated previously, the most prominent man of letters in England. To attack his performance on such a major enterprise as his edition of Shakespeare was indeed a very dangerous thing to do, and also there were few critics who possessed the necessary knowledge to do so. As Lounsbury says:

> So uncritical was the age, so potent was Pope's opinion, especially in matters of versification, that the host of changes silently made by him in the text with the implied or avowed intent of improving and perfecting it, were blindly adopted by his immediate successors without any thought apparently of questioning their necessity or desirability.[35]

As pointed out in chapter two,[36] even Theobald uncritically followed many of Pope's alterations to Shakespeare's text, but his Shakespeare Restored opened the way for a number of lesser critics to attack Pope's editorial work. W.L. MacDonald makes the point that "it must ... be emphasized that Theobald was the first to write during Pope's lifetime a substantial criticism of one of his major works,"[37] and Theobald's action loosened the tongues of many less courageous critics. A typical example of such a critic, against whom Pope felt particular animosity, was Mathew Concanen. An able journalist but a thoroughly average poet, Concanen seemed to derive special pleasure from seeing the great Pope deflated by a rather average writer. As MacDonald says, "Concanen probably voiced the sentiments of many when he expressed his own admiration of the critical work of Theobald, thus intimating that, in the estimation of a few critics at least, Theobald had thoroughly discredited the editor of the Tonson edition."[38]

Modern critical opinion, as we saw in chapter two,[39] while not completely turning against Theobald, has certainly tended to lessen the importance of some of his criticism of Pope. The whole controversy between the two men, replete with sycophants on both sides, has been well documented by several critics,[40] and hardly needs repeating. It is difficult to find very much sound criticism on either side, as the quarrel quickly deteriorated into a barrage of personal abuse and name calling. MacDonald's final assessment of the issue seems most apt:

> The whole Shakespeare episode is characteristic of the mad melee of personalities who surged round the Dunciad. One imagines the ghost of Shakespeare rocking with Olympian mirth as he viewed the undignified affray of which he was the innocent cause and from which he had unobtrusively withdrawn.[41]

Let us now examine exactly what Pope did accomplish in his edition of Shakespeare, and try to determine why he handled Shakespeare's text as he did. The logical place to discover Pope's views on Shakespeare's art and on his text is in his own preface.

David Nichol Smith calls Pope's preface "the best and the representative piece of Shakespearean criticism written during the first half of the eighteenth century,"[42] and indeed in the preface one finds evidence of Pope's reading of almost all of the influential Neo-classical critics of Shakespeare. As Smith points out, "Pope has read Dryden; he has also read Rymer, and Farquhar's Discourse upon Comedy, and Gildon's Essay on the Stage and Dennis's Letters on the Genius and Writings of Shakespeare."[43] What Pope attempted to do in his preface was to provide the reader with a carefully organized synthesis of the praises that had been accorded to Shakespeare by the major Neo-classical critics, and at the same time at least partially to answer the criticisms that had been made against Shakespeare's art by the strict "rules" critics. It must be remembered that at this time many of the public had only seen Shakespeare's plays in the form of rather loose adaptations, and it certainly had to be one of Pope's aims in the preface to convince his readers that Shakespeare was worth reading in the original. The extent to which the eighteenth-century public was subjected to these adaptations, at the expense of seeing Shakespeare's plays as he originally wrote them, is made clear by Malcolm Goldstein, who makes the fascinating point that even Pope had not had an opportunity to see a number of plays which he was editing performed as they were originally written:

> Pope ... never saw any version of Richard III but Cibber's, even on the momentous occasion when he watched Garrick in the part; at no time did he have an opportunity to see Antony and Cleopatra, which had been entirely superceded by Dryden's All for Love, and he had been requested by Sheffield and Hill to give thought to their new versions of Julius Caesar.[44]

Pope, then, had to be concerned with convincing at least some of his potential readers of Shakespeare's value.

To do so, Pope began by pointing out that Shakespeare was certainly not a perfect writer, but rather "... of all English poets Shakespear must be confessed to be the fairest and fullest subject for Criticism, and to afford the most numerous, as well as most conspicuous instances, both of Beauties and Faults of all sorts."[45] Pope then elaborated upon Shakespeare's "beauties," and in doing so he found it necessary to answer the objections of the so-called "rules" critics, such as Thomas Rymer. One of the strongest objections posed by such critics was that Shakespeare was either completely ignorant of the classical rules of drama, or blatantly ignored them, and hence his plays all have a disturbing irregularity. To answer this charge Pope returned to the distinction made by Dryden, that Shakespeare was a poet of nature, as opposed to a poet of art, and was therefore above the classical rules. As Pope said:

> If ever any author deserved the name of an Original, it was Shakespear. Homer himself drew not his art so immediately from the fountains of Nature, it proceeded thro' AEgyptian strainers and channels, and came to him not without some tincture of the learning, or some cast of the models, of those before him. The Poetry of Shakespear was Inspiration indeed: he is not so much an Imitator, as an Instrument, of Nature: and 'tis not so just to say he speaks from her, as that she speaks thro' him.[46]

Obviously, then, a poet such as Shakespeare, who was so much a part of Nature that he was really Nature's spokesman rather than her imitator, had no reason to labour over the forms of his plays. Because of his oneness with Nature, Shakespeare had the ability to create the most individual characters of any writer, and Pope considered Shakespeare's power over the passions to be one of his greatest assets:

> The Power over our Passions was never possess'd in a more eminent degree, or display'd in so different instances. Yet all along, there is seen no labour, no pains to raise them; no preparation to guide our guess to the effect, or be perceiv'd to lead toward it: But the heart swells, and the tears burst out, just at the proper places: We are surpriz'd, the moment we weep; and yet upon reflection find the passion so just, that we shou'd be surpriz'd if we had not wept, and wept at that very moment.[47]

Coupled with Shakespeare's power over the passions, Pope also found his powers of reflection and reasoning to be unequaled. Pope concluded his praise of Shakespeare by saying that he is "the only Author that gives ground for a very new opinion, that the Philosopher and even the Man of the world, may be Born, as well as the Poet."[48]

Pope's praise of Shakespeare, then, was indeed great, but really not very original. As we noticed in chapter two, critics such as Dryden and Addison were constantly praising Shakespeare for his power over the passions and justifying his neglect of the classical rules because he was the "poet of nature." Pope's answer to the critics who disparage Shakespeare's use of bombast or vulgar expression was also not very original.

Pope, of course, completely agreed that Shakespeare's language was at times base and corrupt, and he accounted for this baseness by pointing to the age in which Shakespeare lived. Shakespeare made his living as a playwright, and in order to be successful he had to compromise his ideals to appeal to a base audience. Pope's argument represents a slight variation on the notion that Shakespeare was part of a base age, and therefore naturally wrote in a low way, but really the idea is the same. The Elizabethans were generally a low lot; and their ideas of what constituted entertainment were not those generally accepted by the much more refined eighteenth-century theatre-goer. Pope characterized the Elizabethan audience and its taste as follows:

> The Audience was generally composed of the meaner sort of people; and therefore the Images of Life were to be drawn from those of their own rank: accordingly we find, that not our Author's only but almost all the old Comedies have their Scene among Tradesmen and Mechanicks: And even their Historical Plays strictly follow the common Old Stories or Vulgar Traditions of that kind of people. In Tragedy, nothing was so sure to Surprize and cause Admiration, as the most strange, unexpected, and consequently most unnatural, Events and Incidents; the most exaggerated Thoughts; the most verbose and bombast Expression; the most pompous Rhymes, and thundering Versification. In Comedy, nothing was so sure to please, as mean buffoonry, vile ribaldry, and unmannerly jests of fools and clowns.[49]

Pope's attitude here is obvious. He is the cultured eighteenth-century gentleman looking down at a rather childish and certainly culturally inferior age. This attitude, as we shall see, is rather often reflected in the notes in his edition, and frequently it affected his editing practices. Pope at times simply could not allow the low material that Shakespeare wrote purely to please the "Tradesmen and Mechanicks" to remain part of his edition. To have done so would have been a grave remission of his duty, as he viewed it.

This same idea is used a bit farther on in the preface to account for what Pope considered to be the deplorable state of the text at the time. Not only was Shakespeare an actor himself, and hence forced to compromise his notions about language in order to please his fellows, he also had the misfortune of having his works edited by actors, who had no compunction about changing the language when they felt that to do so would increase the appeal of the play to the audience. Pope was especially hard on the editors of the First Folio, "two Players, Heming and Condell,"[50] contending that only the "literal" errors were purged from the earlier quarto editions by these editors, and that in all other respects the plays found in the First Folio are greatly inferior to the quarto versions.

The specific reasons that Pope cited for his dislike of the Folio texts are very interesting. He began with the following objection:

> ... the additions of trifling and bombast passages are in this edition far more numerous. For whatever had been added, since those Quartos, by the actors, or had been stolen from their mouths into written parts, were from thence conveyed into the printed text, and all stand charged upon the Author.[51]

Pope will use this claim time and time again in his edition to justify the omission of words, lines and indeed whole speeches of which he happened to disapprove. Sometimes he will see fit to relegate these parts of

Shakespeare's text to the bottom of the page, but just as frequently they will simply be omitted. The actors, then, formed convenient scapegoats for Pope. Since they were responsible for many "trifling and bombast" passages, Pope was only purifying Shakespeare's text by omitting these passages. A bit farther on in the same paragraph, Pope pointed to Romeo and Juliet as a prime example of a play that has been badly corrupted by actors' unnecessary and harmful additions. We shall be looking at Pope's most peculiar handling of this play somewhat later on in this chapter.

Pope's second objection to the Folio texts was that "a number of beautiful passages which are extant in the first single editions are omitted in this: as it seems, without any other reason, than their willingness to shorten some scenes."[52] Pope is certainly correct here, and one of the great virtues of his edition is that he restored many lines from the quartos which had been lost in the folios and Rowe's edition. However, the important thing to notice is the logic behind Pope's objection to the Folio texts. The passages that the Folio omits must be Shakespeare's because they are "beautiful." Who is the judge of their beauty? Why, Pope himself. If this logic is coupled with the first objection that Pope made to the Folio texts, one of his fundamental editing principles becomes clear. If he does not like a passage, he will immediately suspect that it cannot be Shakespeare's, and he will look for excuses to omit it. If he does like a passage, he immediately assumes that it must be Shakespeare's, and he will add it to his text. Even someone possessing such exquisite taste as Pope was bound to get into trouble by relying upon such an editorial philosophy.

To reinforce the idea that many "poor" passages found in the Folio texts, and indeed also found in the quartos, were not by Shakespeare, Pope made the following point:

> This edition [First Folio] is said to be printed from the Original Copies; I believe they meant those which had lain ever since the Author's days in the play-house, and had from time to time been cut, or added to, arbitrarily. It appears that this edition, as well as the Quarto's, was printed (at least partly) from no better copies than the Prompter's Book, or Piece-meal Parts written out for the use of the actors.[53]

This argument is interesting because, as H.W. Crundell points out, "Pope [has] in fact made the earliest and one of the most carefully worded references to the subject of 'assembled' text,"[54] but it is perhaps more interesting in that it gives Pope one more reason to take liberties with the given text. If the texts had, in fact, "been cut or added to arbitrarily" since Shakespeare's day, the editor certainly has no responsibility to adhere strictly to them. In fact, his responsibility lies in the other direction. Shakespeare's texts had to be purified of the corruption that had infiltrated them after his time.

One more excuse that Pope set up in the preface for the liberties that he will take with the text is his claim that the press responsible for the printing of the quartos was extremely careless and that Shakespeare rarely, if ever, supervised these printings himself. Pope claimed that probably no correcter, or at best a very incompetent one, was present for the printing of the majority of these plays. Obviously, then, it was the editor's duty to prune Shakespeare's text of the errors caused by a careless printer.

The picture of Shakespeare's text that Pope presented the reader with in the preface, then, is very important for an understanding of the editing techniques that he employed. The text, as Pope viewed it, was full of corruptions caused either by additions and deletions by actors, poor copy from which the plays were printed, or carelessness by the printers themselves. We cannot completely condemn Pope for holding these opinions about Shakespeare's text. In certain respects his views were probably correct, if perhaps a bit excessive. However, as we shall see, where Pope went astray was in his attempt to restore Shakespeare's text. Rather than approaching the text bibliographically, and attempting to discern the various relationships between individual texts in order to arrive at a correct reading, Pope relied almost exclusively upon his own aesthetic judgment to determine what Shakespeare wrote. Inevitably, in many cases what we are left with is not what Shakespeare wrote, but what Pope thought he should have written.

After having prepared the reader for his technique of handling the major textual problems, Pope enumerated a number of minor improvements that he made to previous editions of Shakespeare's plays. Such aspects are mentioned as the division of the various plays into acts and scenes, the sorting out of characters' names along with the improvements made to the lists of Dramatis Personae, and the proper allocation of speeches. It is generally conceded that Pope handled these aspects of the text in a very competent manner.

Near the end of the preface, Pope made another very interesting remark about the qualifications of the early printers. "Prose from verse they did not know, and they accordingly printed one for the other throughout the volume."[55] It is interesting to note that again Pope did not blame Shakespeare for this fault in the text, but rather placed the blame on the printers. As pointed out in chapter two,[56] the eighteenth century had very strict notions of what should be written as verse, and what as prose. It is doubtful that Shakespeare would have been nearly as particular in this regard as Pope was. However, if anyone was competent to tell the difference between what was meant as prose and what was meant as verse, it was Pope.

Perhaps one other point should be mentioned before we leave Pope's preface. Near the end, he discussed his method of distinguishing what he considered to be Shakespeare's finest lines:

> Some of the most shining passages are distinguish'd by comma's in the margin; and where the beauty lay not in particulars but in the whole, a star is prefix'd to the scene. This seems to me a shorter and less ostentatious method of performing the better half of Criticism (namely the pointing out of an Author's excellencies) than to fill a whole paper with citations of fine passages, with general Applauses, or empty Exclamations at the tail of them.[57]

It was in this area that Pope was in his element. There have been several fine studies made of Pope's taste in Shakespeare,[58] and really the issue falls somewhat outside the scope of this study; but the reader should be aware that Pope no doubt took pride in this aspect of his edition. Certainly much of Pope's editorial technique was based on his personal opinion of Shakespeare's lines, and a study of what he obviously enjoyed in Shakespeare is a most interesting and worthwhile pursuit.

The concluding paragraph of Pope's preface deserves to be quoted in full:

> I will conclude by saying of Shakespear, that with all his faults, and with all the irregularity of his Drama, one may look upon his works, in comparison of those that are more finish'd and regular, as upon an ancient majestick piece of Gothick Architecture, compar'd with a neat Modern Building: The latter is more elegant and glaring, but the former is more strong and more solemn. It must be allow'd, that in

> one of these there are materials enough to make many of the other. It has much the greater variety, and much the nobler apartments; tho' we are often conducted to them by dark, odd, and uncouth passages. Nor does the Whole fail to strike us with greater reverence, tho' many of the Parts are childish, ill-plac'd, and unequal to its grandeur.[59]

In this paragraph Pope succinctly summed up all of his feelings concerning Shakespeare's work, and ultimately told the reader why he undertook his task as editor. Pope's image of Shakespeare's works being like a piece of Gothic architecture is brilliant. He even managed, through the use of the word "passages," to make the comparison more exact. Many of Shakespeare's "passages" were considered by the eighteenth-century reader to be "dark, odd and uncouth," and many parts of his work were thought to be "childish" and "ill-plac'd," but still the grandeur of the whole remained. Pope saw his duty clearly. He would, first of all, acquaint the reader with Shakespeare's grandeur, pointing out instances where this quality was most apparent. Secondly, he would prune the text of all corruptions that might tend somehow to lessen Shakespeare's reputation; and thirdly he would, where necessary, alter what Shakespeare had written in order to make it more conformable to more refined eighteenth-century sensibilities. Pope certainly considered these duties as constituting the true task of the editor. Shakespeare was a literary friend, and every effort had to be made to insure that he attained the status he so richly deserved. We, today, must see Pope's editorial labours as a sincere attempt to treat Shakespeare's text as fairly as he could. Unfortunately for Pope, from our perspective it seems as though his zeal occasionally overpowered his judgment.

One very unfair criticism of Pope's editorial work is that he was lax or careless in his duties. Again, this criticism probably arises because modern critics have not taken the trouble to investigate the state of scholarship during the period that Pope was working on his edition, and also they have not attempted to assess Pope's motives for editing as he did. An excellent article which has done much to exonerate Pope from this charge of carelessness is John A. Hart's "Pope as Scholar-Editor." Hart attacks the assertions made by critics such as Lounsbury and Hans Schmidt,[60] that Pope was a careless collator and word-definer, and, by examining Pope's motives and the state of scholarship at the time, he presents a very convincing defense of Pope's performance. We shall be returning to Hart's article later on in this chapter when we examine Pope's work as a collator, but right now let us concern ourselves with Hart's defense of Pope's ability to define words.

Since one of Pope's primary goals in editing Shakespeare's works was to increase their popularity, he had to define a number of what he considered to be the more obscure words in the text. As we saw from Atterbury's letter to Pope,[61] reading Shakespeare had in many instances become tantamount to reading a foreign language, so the defining of Shakespeare's more difficult words was a very important duty for Pope to perform. The sincerity of Pope's desire to popularize Shakespeare becomes suspect if we accept Lounsbury's verdict that Pope performed his task of defining in a very haphazard manner. Lounsbury admits that the Augustan vocabulary was rather limited in comparison to our own or to the Elizabethan, but he goes on to make the following assertion:

> ... it is difficult to believe that several of
> those [words] that [Pope] felt it incumbent
> to define could have been unknown to the men

> of his generation. Even if strange, their signification in most cases could have been easily guessed from the context. Where so vast a number of really difficult words were passed over in silence, it would seem hardly worth while to inform the reader, as did Pope, that bolted means 'sifted,' that budge means 'give way,' that eld means 'old age,' that sometime means 'formerly,' that rood means 'cross,' and that the verb witch means 'bewitch.' These, and others like them, could not have been deemed obsolete: some of them it would hardly have been right to call unusual.[62]

Lounsbury here is a perfect example of a twentieth-century critic who, because of his ignorance of the conditions under which Pope worked, condemns him unfairly. Hart puts Pope's situation in its proper perspective when he answers Lounsbury's criticism:

> But these words were unusual and strange in 1725, as an examination of their history in the New English Dictionary reveals. The list of quotations illustrating the use of each word omits in almost every case a quotation from the period immediately preceding or following Pope's edition; "gyves," dated in 1704, and "bolted," which Pope himself used in the Odyssey, 1725, are the only two examples (except dialect versions) found in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. It is not difficult to believe that Pope felt it necessary to define these words; his edition, which was directed primarily to the general reader of his time, had to be comprehensible if it was to succeed, and Pope was certainly trying to make the text clear; he was not merely making a pretense of scholarship.[63]

In a similar fashion, Hart is able to defend Pope against Lounsbury's charges that he defined words inaccurately,[64] and that he supplied his readers with faulty etymologies.[65] Hart proves conclusively that Pope relied on contemporary dictionaries, such as Bailey's Dictionary (1721) for his information, and that he cannot be blamed for any inaccuracies which may have resulted. As Hart says, "[Pope] defined as many words as he could according to the best authorities of his day; where he failed, the failure may be attributed to the age in which he lived."[66]

Pope, then, was not as careless in this aspect of his editorial duties as many critics have claimed. However, we still must examine two other aspects of Pope's edition, his seemingly gratuitous minor changes to Shakespeare's text, and his handling of the early quartos and folios. It is in these two areas that Pope has been most strongly criticized, and, as we shall see, the criticism is, from a twentieth-century viewpoint at least, certainly justified.

Perhaps the best method of examining the types of minor changes that Pope made to Shakespeare's text is to look at a play where he had no early quartos to turn to for suggestions of alternate readings. In his work on The Tempest, for example, Pope could only examine the folios or Rowe's edition to find alternate readings when he was unhappy with Shakespeare's text, and hence he was forced to make a fair number of original emendations. The following table will provide the reader with a clear idea of how Pope went about the editing of this play.

Analysis of Pope's Editorial Work on The Tempest[67]

Act 1, Scene 1

1 addition of stage setting.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.
1 change of position of stage direction.

1 word omitted in order to improve meter.

1 reversal of word order.

---

8 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.
1 occasion where Pope follows F.1 rather than Rowe's text.

Act 1, Scene 2

1 addition of stage setting.
3 additions of stage directions.

10 contractions.
2 contractions expanded into two words.

8 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

4 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

1 transposition of line order.

3 occasions where Pope follows the reading of Dryden's adaptation.

----

39 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.
3 occasions where Pope follows F.1 rather than Rowe's text.

Act 2, Scene 1

1 addition of stage setting.
1 omission of stage direction.

1 contraction.

4 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

----

17 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.
3 occasions where Pope follows F.1 rather than Rowe's text.

Act 2, Scene 2

1 addition of stage setting.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.
1 occasion where a word change is likely the result of a misprint.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

1 reversal of word order.

---

10 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's test rather than F.1.

Act 3, Scene 1

1 addition of stage setting.

6 contractions.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

---

5 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.

Act 3, Scene 2

1 addition of stage setting.

1 contraction.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

---

13 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.

Act 3, Scene 3

1 addition of stage setting.
1 change of position of stage direction.

2 contractions.
1 contraction changed. (i.e. "that he's" to "that's he")

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

----

8 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.
2 occasions where Pope follows F.1 rather than Rowe's text.

Act 4, Scene 1

2 additions of stage setting.

1 contraction.

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

----

16 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.

Act 5, Scene 1

6 contractions.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

22 occasions where Pope follows Rowe's text rather than F.1.

Epilogue

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve the meter.

TOTALS

Total number of alterations	140
Number concerned with staging	16
Number concerned with meter	72
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	22
Number concerned with meaning	18
Number for other reasons	12
Number of variations between Rowe's edition and F.1	147
Number of times Pope follows Rowe's edition	138
Number of times Pope follows F.1	9

The fact that one immediately notices about Pope's work on this play is that the vast majority of alterations were made in order to regularize Shakespeare's meter. In order to do so, Pope would either add words, omit words or actually change words, always aiming to make Shakespeare's lines conform to the "measured monotony"[68] of eighteenth-century verse. In Act 1, scene 2, for example, the Folio contains the following dialogue between Prospero and Miranda:

> Pros. Being once perfected how to graunt suites,
> how to deny them: who t'advance, and who
> To trash for over-topping; new created
> The creatures that were mine, I say, or chang'd em,
> Or els new form'd 'em; having both the key,
> Of Officer, and office, set all hearts i' th state
> To what tune pleas'd his eare, that now he was

> The Ivy which had hid my princely Trunck,
> And suckt my verdure out on't: thou attend'st not?
>
> Mira. O good Sir, I doe.
>
> Pros. I pray thee marke me. (96-106)

Pope attempted to improve Shakespeare's meter by omitting the phrase "i' th state" in line 101, by omitting Miranda's exclamatory "O" in line 105, and by adding the word "then" at the end of line 106. As we can see, then, Pope's attempts to improve Shakespeare's meter rarely had any effect on the meaning of the original lines; and Pope seldom, if ever, considered it necessary to draw the reader's attention to his alterations with a note. As stated before, Pope considered Shakespeare to be a literary friend, and in altering his text to "improve" the meter he was only according Shakespeare the same favour that he would have accorded any friend. No doubt he felt that not to have corrected faulty meter would have been a serious remission of his editorial duties.

Of course, such an idea is completely opposed to modern notions of the duty of an editor. Instead of attempting to purify Shakespeare's text by eliminating all the words written by others, Pope was purposely and consciously adding to the corruption. Lounsbury's assessment of Pope's work on Shakespeare's metrics is accurate:

> The process was objectionable, and the results were untrustworthy. It was objectionable, not merely because it represented Shakespeare berouged, periwigged, and attired generally according to the fashionable literary mode of the eighteenth century, but because it often happened that what was gained in artificial harmony was more than lost in expressiveness and force. It was untrustworthy because the changes made were sometimes due to the ignorance of the grammar and pronunciation of the period as well as of its methods of versification. No small share of the work of later students of Shakespeare has been to

6

> relieve the text from the alterations made in it by earlier editors, and to restore it as far as possible to the state in which it had originally appeared.[69]

The same objections may be made to Pope's efforts at improving Shakespeare's grammar or modernizing his language. In Act 4, scene 1, where the Folio reads "... who, once againe/I tender to thy hand" (6), Pope changed "who" to "whom'; and, later on in the same scene, he altered the Folio's "So rare a wondred Father, and a wife/Makes this place Paradise" (137-38), by substituting "Make" for "Makes." Pope also modernized such words as "mine" to "my," "littour" to "litter," and "affeard" to "afraid." Obviously, what Pope was attempting to do was to make Shakespeare's plays completely acceptable to the eighteenth-century reading public. The cultured eighteenth-century reader would find it difficult to accept the writings of someone who occasionally used bad grammar or quaint and antiquated words, so Pope saw his duty clearly. In order to popularize Shakespeare's works, he had to take liberties with the text.

This desire for popularization also shows itself in Pope's work on the staging of The Tempest. In every case where the scene of the action was not clear, Pope added a note on setting. If a stage direction was called for or if an existing one was unclear, Pope either added a new direction or reworded the old. Obviously Pope's work on this aspect of Shakespeare's text made the plays much easier to read, and this was Pope's goal.

Of the eighteen changes that Pope made which somehow affected the meaning of the text of The Tempest, none really altered the meaning very greatly. Pope's typical sort of alteration may be seen by looking at a passage in Act 1, scene 1, which reads as follows in the folios and

Rowe: "I doe not thinke thou canst, for then thou was't not/Out three yeers old" (49-50). Pope changed "out" to "full." In Act 5, scene 1, a similar sort of alteration was made. The folios and Rowe include the line "... we were dead of sleepe" (275), which was altered by Pope to "... we were dead a-sleepe." This type of minor alteration was made simply to clarify what Pope considered to be an unclear passage in Shakespeare's text.

Occasionally, though, an alteration occurs which some might consider to be more significant. In Act 1, scene 2, for example, the earlier editions read, "This is not mortall busines, nor no sound/That the earth owes" (470-71). Here Pope changed "owes" to "owns," which, it might be argued, slightly changes the meaning of the line. However, the Arden editors point out that in this instance "owes" means "owns," since it is used with this meaning on two other occasions in the play.[70]

In Act 2, scene 1, we have a similar sort of alteration. Here the folios and Rowe have "I saw their weapons drawne: there was a noyse,/ That's verily: 'tis best we stand upon our guard" (356-57). Pope changed "verily" to "verity." Here the change in meaning is extremely slight, and Pope's reading is noted by the Arden editors.[71] Furness says that "Pope's 'verity' is doubtless good, Keightly pronounces it 'most certain'."[72] However, after quoting several examples which show Shakespeare using a similar construction to the one above, Furness also rejects Pope's reading.

Act 3, scene 1, provides us with a very revealing example of Pope's editorial technique. The folios and Rowe's edition contain the line "Most busie lest, when I do it" (17). As Furness points out, "This passage has received a greater number of emendations and staggers under a heavier weight of comment than, I believe, any other in Shakespeare, not excepting even Juliet's 'runaways eyes'."[73] Pope changed the wording to "Least busie when I do it," and recorded "Most busy least" at the bottom of the page. Here Pope did make some sense of an obviously corrupted line, but the emendation clearly shows what is wrong with his method. Pope merely combined and changed Shakespeare's words in order to have them make sense, and did not concern himself with whether or not Shakespeare could possibly have written the lines as he emended them. There is no place in The Tempest where Pope's method of emendation so obviously varies from that employed by modern editors.[74]

On the whole, then, we can see that while Pope's emendations very rarely affected the overall meaning of Shakespeare's text, they were seldom based on sound editorial principles. Ultimately, Pope saw himself as the final judge of what Shakespeare wrote, and what he should have written.

Pope's use of the Folio text in his collation of The Tempest presents an interesting problem. It would seem from the statistics given above that Pope greatly preferred Rowe's text, and perhaps only consulted the Folio when he was puzzled by something in Rowe's version. However, an examination of the instances where Pope followed the Folio does not support this conclusion. In no case is the reading in Rowe's edition vague or not understandable; rather, it appears that Pope followed the Folio simply because he preferred it in certain instances. Of the nine occasions where Pope accepted the Folio reading, one is a stage direction, two are contractions that Rowe has expanded, two are instances where the Folio's grammar seems superior to Rowe's, one is an instance where an added word in Rowe's text hurts the meter, and three are instances where a word in the Folio, omitted by Rowe, either improves the meter or clarifies the meaning. A brief look at this last category proves the care that Pope took in his collation. In Act 1, scene 2, the Folio has the following lines:

> I thus neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated
> To closeness, and the bettering of my mind
> With that, which but by being so retir'd
> Ore-priz'd all popular rate. (106-10)

Here Rowe, following the Fourth Folio, substituted "being retired" for "being so retir'd." Obviously such a substitution does not affect the meaning of the line, but it does affect the meter. Pope picked this up immediately, and found his correction in the First Folio.

The other two instances are even more positive proof of Pope's careful collation of the Folio, since the difference between Rowe's text and the Folio's is not a difference in metrics. In Act 2, scene 1, the Folio text reads as follows:

> ... She that from whom
> We all were sea-swallow'd, though some cast againe,
> (And by that destiny) to performe an act
> Whereof, what's past is Prologue; what to come
> In yours, and my discharge. (273-77)

Rowe again followed the Fourth Folio, and substituted "past in" for "past is." Pope, on the other hand, restored "past is" and changed "In yours" to "Is yours." Admittedly, such a change might simply have been fortuitous, but it seems far more likely that it was the result of careful collation.

Again, in Act 2, scene 1, Pope changed Rowe's "... how shall that Claribell/Measure us backe by Naples?" (283-84), to the First Folio's "backe to Naples?". It seems almost certain that such a change must have been the result of careful collation.[75]

Generally, then, Pope's work on the text of *The Tempest* was careful and systematic, even though we can see the fallacies of his methods. The text that he presented to the eighteenth-century reader was one that was as metrically and grammatically correct as possible; one that would hopefully clarify the mysteries of Shakespeare's language without changing the meaning of his text. In other words, Pope provided the average eighteenth-century reader with just the sort of text that he wanted.

One of the most interesting aspects of Pope's editorial technique is the manner in which he used the early quarto editions. Even Pope's severest critics credit him with being the first editor to make any substantial use of the quartos, but it has been generally assumed that Pope's collation of these early texts was careless and haphazard. Hans Schmidt is typical in his condemnation of Pope in this regard:

> Without a doubt he had come to the right conclusion in many cases where he followed the quartos. He has investigated the value of the different quarto editions as little as he has investigated that of the folios. His treatment of Rom. and Shr. proves this. The means and manner in which he used the quartos showed his idea of "the dull duty of an editor." He did not use these editions systematically and thoroughly but only occasionally. Some striking examples may show this. Frequently in Lear there are entire lines in the quartos which are not to be found in the folios and Rowe. Pope neither incorporates them into his text nor refers to them in his annotations: ... On the other hand in the quarto editions of Lear words and lines are missing which are to be found in the folios and Rowe. Pope followed his predecessor Rowe without explaining the quarto variations to the reader ...[76]

Hart, however, convincingly argues that Pope was in fact very careful in his collation of the quarto texts. Admittedly, Pope often accorded the quartos a value that they did not deserve, but the reason for this stems from his editorial philosophy. The quartos provided Pope with another authority to which he could appeal in order to delete inferior material or add material which he happened to like.[77] The important thing to remember here is that Pope never accepted a reading from either the quartos or the Folio because it was the most authoritative. Doubtless he had not the patience, inclination, or ability to attempt the sort of bibliographical analysis that finding the most authoritative reading would entail. Ultimately the final judge of whether or not material was worth including in the text was Pope himself. Words and lines that he liked from the quartos were included, words and lines that he did not like in the Folio and that were not found in the quartos were omitted.

That is not to say, however, that Pope was careless or haphazard in his collations of the quarto texts. On the contrary, Hart convincingly shows that Pope was extremely careful with this aspect of his editorial duties. In plays such as King Lear and Hamlet, the nature of the readings that Pope accepted from the early quartos shows his care in comparing the various editions. Hart assesses Pope's work on the Hamlet quartos as follows:

> Of the seventy-five instances in IV, 7 in which q3 or q5 differs from Rowe's text, twenty-six are inserted into Pope's edition. They are such small changes that Pope must have collated very carefully to have detected them. His practice in this scene is again no different from his collation of the rest of the play, showing that his examination of the quarto readings is consistent and thorough in every act.[78]

The same may be said of Pope's use of the 1622 quarto edition of Othello. The following table shows that Pope included readings from the quarto throughout his text, and that in cases where both Rowe's edition and the quarto differed from the Folio, he chose the quarto reading almost as frequently as he chose Rowe's.

Analysis of Pope's Use of his Sources for his Edition of *Othello*.

Number of times Pope follows F. - not Rowe

Act 1 - 14
Act 2 - 6
Act 3 - 7
Act 4 - 3
Act 5 - 4

TOTAL - 34 (Note: On all but 3 occasions F. & Q. agree. On one occasion Pope apparently followed the reading of F.2 or F.3.)

Number of times Pope follows Rowe & F. - not Q.

Act 1 - 152
Act 2 - 215
Act 3 - 197
Act 4 - 205
Act 5 - 162

TOTAL - 931

Number of times Pope follows Rowe - not F. or Q.

Act 1 - 27
Act 2 - 41
Act 3 - 42
Act 4 - 40
Act 5 - 27

TOTAL - 177

Number of times Pope follows Q. - not Rowe or F.

Act 1 - 44
Act 2 - 28
Act 3 - 39
Act 4 - 14
Act 5 - 16

TOTAL - 141

Pope, of course, also made a number of original emendations in the text. However, as in nearly all of the plays, the vast majority of his alterations were made in order to correct what he considered to be Shakespeare's faulty meter. In doing so, he would have little recourse to the quarto edition, the meter of which would be equally "faulty."[80]

It is interesting to examine just how Pope did use his quarto editions. From the following table, we can see that Pope frequently accepted a quarto reading if he thought the meter or grammar of the line would be improved by doing so; but more often he relied upon the quarto to clarify obscurities in the text, or to provide words and lines that he thought would be more acceptable to the eighteenth-century reader. Again, these word changes rarely altered the meaning of the text very greatly, but the frequency of their occurrence shows that Pope must have been collating carefully.

Analysis of Pope's Use of 1722 Quarto of *Othello*

Act 1, Scene 1

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 1, Scene 2

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 1, Scene 3

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
13 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 2, Scene 1

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 contraction.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

8 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 2, Scene 2

1 addition of stage direction.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 1

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 3, Scene 2

No use is made of Quarto.

Act 3, Scene 3

1 contraction.
1 contraction expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
19 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 3, Scene 4

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 contraction.
2 contractions expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 1

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 4, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 5, Scene 1

1 contraction expanded to three words.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 5, Scene 2

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

TOTALS

Number of times Pope follows Quarto	141
Number concerned with staging	6
Number concerned with meter	34
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	23
Number concerned with meaning	69
Number for other reasons	9

A good example of Pope's following of the quarto text because of metrical considerations occurs in Act 3, scene 3, where the Folio and Rowe's edition include the following line: "I slept the next night well, fed well, was free and merrie" (396). Here Pope followed the quarto's lead and omitted "fed well" from the line, obviously with the intention of improving the meter. Charles Knights's reaction to such a procedure typifies that of a number of more recent critics:

> The rejection of these words by the modern editors can be accounted for only by the fact that they would make any sacrifice of sense or poetry, and prefer the feeblest to the strongest expression, if they could prevent the intrusion of a line exceeding ten syllables.[81]

It is interesting to note, however, that the modern Arden editors also follow the quarto here, but the motive is quite different. M.R. Ridley, editor of the Arden Othello, provides the reader with a complex and thorough bibliographical analysis of the text,[82] finally arriving at the conclusion that "... in Q1, amplified by the reinstatement of the cuts, we have as near an approximation as we are likely to get to the play as Shakespeare first wrote it, with nothing between us and him but the blunders of honest but not always skilful transcriber and compositor."[83] Ridley and Pope are philosophically far apart here. Ridley adheres to the quarto reading because, after a thorough bibliographical investigation, he has determined that it is likely what Shakespeare actually wrote. One may surely assume by now, however, that Pope included the quarto reading simply because he found it more aesthetically pleasing. Whether Shakespeare actually wrote the line found in the quarto was of secondary importance.

Pope's editorial philosophy also becomes apparent in his use of the quarto to correct Shakespeare's "faulty" grammar. In Act 5, scene 2, the Folio and Rowe's edition contain the following lines:

> Oth: It is the very error of the Moone,
> She comes more neerer Earth than she was wont,
> And makes men mad. (138-40)

In the quarto, the double comparative is corrected by substituting "more neere" for "more neerer," and Pope, of course, followed the quarto reading. Again the Arden edition also follows the quarto in this line, but for vastly different reasons. Ridley certainly is not concerned about whether or not the line is "grammatically correct," but rather with whether or not it represents Shakespeare's exact wording. Pope, however, never would have considered allowing Shakespeare to use grammar that might offend the cultured eighteenth-century reader. No doubt he would have "corrected" Shakespeare's grammar himself if the quarto had not done so for him.

Perhaps Pope's most interesting use of the quarto texts occurs when he uses them to clarify the meaning of a line in the Folio. As we have already seen, Pope frequently turned to the quarto version of Othello for help in this regard, and the following are several of the more interesting examples of his procedure.

In Act 1, scene 3, the Folio and Rowe's edition have Othello say the following lines in his speech describing his wooing of Desdemona: "... Of my redemption thence,/And portance in my Travellours historie" (161-162). The quarto has the much more straightforward wording, "Of my redemption thence,/And with it all my Travellours historie." Pope's course here is obvious. "Portance" is a difficult word for us today, and apparently its meaning was even less clear in the eighteenth century. Furness mentions some of the eighteenth-century attempts to deal with it:

> Rymer (p. 90) in quoting this line reads portents. Johnson reads 'portance in't.;' and explains: 'my redemption from slavery, and my behavior in it.' Steevens: Perhaps Shakespeare meant - my behavior in my travels as described in my history of them.[84]

Pope, as Shakespeare's popularizer, must have breathed a sigh of relief on encountering the straight-forward quarto reading. Again, what Shakespeare actually wrote was probably of little importance to Pope. The quarto clarified what he considered to be an obscurity, and he no doubt felt justified in adopting its reading on that ground alone.[85]

A bit farther on in the same scene we have another interesting example of Pope's use of the quarto text to modify a reading from the Folio. Othello is still describing his courtship of Desdemona, and the Folio and Rowe include the following line: "She gave me for my paines a world of kisses" (182). For "kisses" the quarto substitutes "sighs."

Obviously, these readings are equally understandable, but Pope was quick to choose the latter. His reason for doing so, expressed in a note at the bottom of the page, is interesting:

> It was kisses in the later editions. But this is evidenly (sic.) the true reading: the lady had been forward indeed, to give him a world of kisses upon the bare recital of his story, nor does it agree with the following lines.[86]

The word "kisses," occurring at this particular moment in the play, was just too offensive for Pope; and, rather than offend delicate eighteenth-century sensibilities, he gladly substituted the quarto's "sighs."[87]

These are only two of the some sixty-nine instances where Pope chose to adopt a quarto reading in preference to one from the Folio because the quarto in some way clarified or "improved" the Folio text. Pope's method here quickly becomes obvious. He collated the quarto editions very carefully, but his motive was to provide himself with an authority to which he could appeal in order to delete poor passages or add good ones. Ultimately, then, we must conclude that it is unfair to criticise Pope for a lack of diligence in fulfilling this aspect of his editorial duty; but we must also disagree with the motives behind his diligence. The problems caused by his editorial philosophy become even more apparent when we examine his handling of the text of Romeo and Juliet.

In his preface, Pope praised the 1597 quarto of Romeo and Juliet because in it "there is no hint of a great number of the mean conceits and ribaldries now to be found there."[88] This statement provides a clear indication of how Pope will handle the text of the play. He approved of the early quarto not because it might have been more authoritative than the later editions, but primarily because it gave him an excuse to eliminate many of the passages in the play that he found offensive.

Indeed, in most cases Pope did not even print the rejected lines at the bottom of the page, but rather contented himself with such notes as, "In the common editions here follows a ridiculous speech, which is entirely added since the first,"[89] and, "Some few unnecessary verses are omitted in this scene according to the oldest editions."[90] In the following table I have indicated the exact lines that Pope either partially or totally omitted from his edition, so that the reader may check the extent of Pope's mangling for himself. The results, to say the least, are shocking.

Analysis of Pope's Original Emendations in Romeo and Juliet[91]

Act 1, Scene 1

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 contraction

6 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons. (ll. 3-4, 105, 108, 109, 126, 178).

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning. (2 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 1, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter (1.2).
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (1.15).

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 1, Scene 3

1 contraction.
1 contraction expanded into two words.

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 19-20, 78-96, 104).

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (All of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed ("and" to "an").

Act 1, Scene 4

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter (l. 80).
2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 12, 31-32).

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning. (This addition approximates Q1 reading).

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning. (2 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

Act 1, Scene 5

1 addition of stage direction.

1 contraction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter (l. 18).
2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 23-24, l. 62).

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 2, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 37-38).

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 2

6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (5 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

Act 2, Scene 3

1 change of position of stage direction.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (1 of these changes approximate Q 1 reading).

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 4

4 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (11. 40, 42-90, 116-26, 175). Note: The two long passages are included at the bottom of the page.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (1 of these changes approximates Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed ("and" to "an").

Act 2, Scene 5

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (11. 16-17, 18, 22-24).

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (This change approximates Q1 reading).

Act 2, Scene 6

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (1. 143).

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (3 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed ("and" to "an").

Act 3, Scene 2

4 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 48-51, 76-80, 120, 131-137). Note: ll. 76-80 are included at the bottom of the page.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 3

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter (l. 105).
4 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 71-73, 87-88, 118-133, 175).

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (1 of these changes approximates Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 3, Scene 4

5 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 5-6, 10-11, 15-17, 24, 34-35).

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 5

1 addition of stage direction.

1 contraction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter (l. 213).
9 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 33-34, 65, 70-72, 74-76, 120, 125-127, 155-156, 205-208, 211-212).

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter (This change approximates Q1 reaading).
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 alteration of line location.

Act 4, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (l. 118).

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (2 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 4, Scene 2

1 contraction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 3-10). Note: This passage is included at the bottom of the page.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (1 of these changes approximates Q1 reading).

Act 4, Scene 3

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 35, 55-56).

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (1 of these changes approximates Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 4, Scene 4

No original emendations.

Act 4, Scene 5

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter. (l. 18).
6 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 38-40, 53-65, 68-78, 90-95, 111-114, 120-121).

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (3 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed ("and" to "an").

Act 5, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter (l. 15).

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (l. 23).

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (2 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

Act 5, Scene 2

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 5, Scene 3

1 addition of stage direction.
2 alterations of wording of stage direction.
1 alteration of placement of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter (l. 190).
6 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons (ll. 66-67, 84, 85-91, 159, 166, 178-180).

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
7 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning (2 of these changes approximate Q1 reading).

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

TOTALS

Total number of alterations	202
Number concerned with staging	10
Number concerned with meter	37
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	14
Number concerned with meaning	74 (32 of which approximate Q1 reading).
Number for other reasons	67

It would be pointless to try to discover Pope's reasons for omitting as much of the text as he did; indeed, in a number of cases his reasons are probably beyond discovery. It is interesting, however, to look at several instances where Pope's eighteenth-century sensibility obviously got the better of his judgment. In Act 3, scene 5, for example, Pope ruthlessly omitted a number of lines from the text, obviously because he did not approve of the type of wordplay and punning that they contain. The following lines are all omitted from the scene:

> Juliet: Since arm from arm that voice doth us affray,
> Hunting thee hence with hunts-up to the day.
> (III,v,33-34)
>
> Juliet: Is she not down so late, or up so early?
> (III,v,65)
>
> La. Cap.: An if thou couldst, thou couldst not make him live;
> Therefore have done: some grief shows much of love,
> But much of grief shows still some want of wit.
> (III,v,70-72)
>
> Cap.: Out, you green-sickness carrion! out, you baggage!
> You tallow-face!
> (III,v,155-156)
>
> Juliet: My husband is on earth, my faith in heaven;
> How shall that faith return again to earth,
> Unless that husband send it me from heaven
> By leaving earth? - comfort me, counsel me.
> (III,v,205-208)

These represent only about half of the lines Pope omitted from this relatively short scene, and yet his only note is the following: "Several unnecessary lines are omitted in this scene, which is printed more agreeably to the first edition."[92] One can only cringe when one sees the omission of countless passages throughout the play justified in such a manner. As Lounsbury says, "There are instances in which it is hard to say whether the recklessness or the audacity displayed in these rejections is the greater."[93]

It might seem somewhat unfair to close our discussion of Pope's editorial performance by examining a play that certainly shows him at his worst, but really his methods in Romeo and Juliet are typical. His collation of the early texts was careful.[94] There was nothing haphazard or careless in any of Pope's editorial work. We have to give him full credit for being the first to go back to the old editions with any kind of regularity, and certainly he recovered a great many authoritative readings not found in Rowe's edition. However, as I have been stressing throughout this chapter, Pope's motives were different from those of the contemporary editor. He felt that his duty was to popularize Shakespeare, and to do so he had to make the text more acceptable to the eighteenth-century reader. This occasionally entailed the taking of great liberties; liberties which he felt were perfectly justified. Unfortunately for Pope, we today have generally lost sight of his motives, and tend to condemn what we consider to be his obviously flawed editorial philosophy. It is much fairer to see Pope's edition as a necessary part of the literature of the time, and to realize that it was inevitable that new and better editions of Shakespeare's works would appear as his popularity became assured. In a little more than thirty years time, Edward Capell would publish his edition of Shakespeare, and the roots of modern editorial technique would finally begin to take a firm hold.

Chapter IV

Edward Capell's Edition of Shakespeare

In his Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare, Richard Farmer referred to Edward Capell as "a very curious and intelligent Gentleman, to whom the lovers of Shakespeare will some time or other owe great obligations."[1] Indeed, Farmer was being extremely perceptive here, but unfortunately for Capell these obligations were for a long time ignored, and it is only in recent years that Capell has begun to receive the praise that he deserves for his editorial labours on Shakespeare's text.[2] It is my contention that Capell is, in fact, the most important of all of Shakespeare's early editors, and that he really anticipated many of the editorial techniques held in favour today.

It is not difficult to ascertain why Capell's edition was not initially accorded the praise it deserved. In his edition we have for the first time an editor who was primarily concerned with recovering Shakespeare's true text, and hence many of his notes and most of his introduction were concerned with textual matters, and not with the sort of critical discussion that had interested all previous editors. Rather than spend pages and pages discussing Shakespeare's natural genius, his ability to move the passions, his lack of Classical learning, and his occasionally barbarous language, Capell devoted himself to a discussion of the proper methods of editing the text itself, and spent most of his time discussing variant readings and the transmission of the early texts. A passage in his introduction shows that he was well aware that he was breaking new ground here. After having spent almost thirty pages primarily discussing textual matters, Capell included the following paragraph:

> Thus have we run through, in as brief a manner as possible, all the several heads, of which it was thought proper and even necessary that the public should be appriz'd; as well those that concern preceding editions, both old and new; as the other which we have just quitted, - the method observ'd in the edition that is now before them: which though not so entertaining, it is confess'd, nor affording so much room to display the parts and talents of a writer, as some other topicks that have generally supply'd the place of them; such as, - criticisms or panegyricks upon the Author, historical anecdotes, essays, and _florilegia_; yet there will be found some odd people, who may be apt to pronounce of them - that they are suitable to the place they stand in, and convey all the instruction that should be look'd for in a preface.[3]

Understandably, Capell's apparent obsession with textual matters was not appreciated by most of the eighteenth-century reading public. Two years before Capell's edition was published, the public had received the edition of perhaps the greatest man of letters in the whole eighteenth century, Dr. Samuel Johnson. As we have seen, Johnson did have some interesting things to say about Shakespeare's text, but he was certainly much more interested in the then standard type of criticism than in textual matters. Capell's interest in the text was considered by many to be a waste of time. Alice Walker characterizes the general eighteenth-century attitude towards Capell's edition as follows:

> Warburton thought it 'fantastical' that he should vie with Johnson and begged Garrick to get him to stand down and leave Johnson a clear field. When Capell's edition appeared (in 1768), his contemporaries thought poorly of it, since it had no explanatory notes, and when his _Notes_ were published they professed not to understand them.[4]

Even Samuel Pegge, a friend of Capell's who wrote a brief sketch of him in order to rectify what he considered to be the "very transient and disrespectful mention that is made of Mr. Capell in Biographia Dramatica, 1782,"[5] could not applaud Capell's interest in Shakespeare's text. In fact, the tone of his comment on this aspect of Capell's work strongly suggests that he considered much of Capell's labour to be unnecessary:

> It cannot be allowed that Mr. Capell had any genius, by which I mean wit or invention; for nothing original is known to have been written by him.... Neither had he any tincture of what is called taste. He had not even pretentions to the intermediate rank of an Antiquary (for he held them rather in contempt), though he of necessity met with so many passages in Shakespeare relative to ancient customs and manners. These he seems to have overlooked in search of various readings, for which I need but refer to his Notes, wherein he is much more busy in comparing Editions than in elucidating his Author. He is so far rather a Commentator on the old Editions than on the Poet himself; a task hardly worth the pains of a German Grammarian, considering how loosely Shakespeare has been printed in the first impressions.[6]

Capell, then, was definitely breaking new ground with his edition of Shakespeare; and, like most pioneers, his work was not fully appreciated in his own time.

Another factor which probably contributed to the poor reception of Capell's edition is that he was generally not well known as a man of letters, and took little or no active part in the literary social life of eighteenth-century London. Indeed, Pegge characterized Capell as being the next thing to a recluse:

> During the time that he was so immersed in Shakespeare, he secluded himself in great measure from the world, admitting very few people to an audience, and these were such as could talk about Shakespeare themselves,

> or had patience to hear him on the subject:- but he that strenuously opposed his opinions was forbid the court. If you had sufficient address to hear him prose about various readings, transpositions of passages, etc. you might preserve yourself tolerably well in his grace:- but it was labour and sorrow, for he was all over Shakespeare. He used to frequent the evening conversazione at the Bishop of Lincoln's (Green) - and afterwards at Dr. Heberden's; but it is said that the share he took in them was not the most agreeable, from his being too opiniatre and dictatorial. When he left off attending these Attic evenings, he became almost an anchorite.[7]

Later on in his essay Pegge said that "When [Capell] came to town in October, for the ten years preceding his death, nothing but the most urgent business could draw him out of doors."[8] Capell, then, was certainly a very solitary man, and obviously he did not have the fame of a Pope or a Johnson with which to instill interest in his edition of Shakespeare. It would seem from Pegge's account that the only prominent literary figure Capell knew very well was David Garrick and even that friendship was a rather stormy one.[9] Capell, then, was hardly in an ideal position to have his edition of Shakespeare become very popular.

Why, then, did Capell decide to edit Shakespeare's works in the first place? The answer to this question is to be found in his introduction, where Capell clearly showed that his edition of Shakespeare was indeed a work of love. Having long been shocked by the deplorable state of Shakespeare's text, Capell felt compelled to take action after the publication of what he considered to be the most disgraceful of all the editions of Shakespeare, that of Sir Thomas Hanmer. Capell, (referring to himself in the third person, as he did throughout his introduction), described the inception of his own edition as follows:

> ... the attempt was first suggested by that gentleman's performance, which came out at Oxford the year before: Which when he had perus'd with no little astonishment, and consider'd the fatal consequences that must inevitably follow the imitation of so much licence, he resolv'd himself to be the champion; and to exert to the uttermost such abilities as he was master of, to save from further ruin an ediface of this dignity, which England must for ever glory in.[10]

Work on the edition, then, was begun as early as 1745; and Capell laboured diligently for some twenty-two years solely for the glory of Shakespeare, for he could not have expected much financial reward. Fortunately, throughout this period he was both Deputy Inspector of Plays and Groom of the Privy Chamber to the Lord Chamberlain, positions which provided him with an income of approximately £300 a year,[11] and later he was to inherit the manors of Troston and Stanton. Capell therefore was able to devote much of his time to his beloved Shakespeare, without bothering too much about his finances. From what Pegge said about Capell, one gathers that the only reward he really wanted was to be recognized as the "Restorer of Shakespeare." Pegge supplied the following amusing, yet touching, anecdote:

> [Capell] piqued himself, and not without some justice, in having purged and reclaimed his Author's Text; insomuch that, being complimented with the title of the Restorer of Shakespeare by a Literary Peer (I think Lord Dacre) he was known to have wept whenever he read the Letter. His vanity, it must be allowed, was a little aided in his weakness by the irritable state of his nerves, occasioned by a sedentary and secluded life. This appelation was the maximum of his wishes;- the misfortune was, that it was said in a private Letter, and not to the world, with which he was undesignedly at war.[12]

Let us now look at Capell's introduction to his edition of Shakespeare, where he clearly enunciated the editorial principles that he employed on Shakespeare's text. Indeed, as we shall see, this introduction deserves to stand as a landmark in the history of Shakespearean textual criticism.

As pointed out previously, perhaps the most glaring error committed by Shakespeare's eighteenth-century editors was that they invariably based their respective editions on that of an immediate or recent predecessor, accumulating all kinds of unnecessary errors in the process. Capell was the first editor to break from this practice, and by doing so he took a giant step forward in editing technique. His rationale is made clear in the introduction:

> ... the superstructure cannot be a sound one, which is built upon so bad a foundation as that work of Mr. Rowe's; which all of them, as we see, in succession, have yet made their corner-stone: The truth is, it was impossible that such a beginning should end better than it has done: the fault was in the setting-out; and all the diligence that could be us'd, join'd to the discernment of a PEARCE, or a BENTLEY, could never purge their Author of all his defects by their method of proceeding.[13]

The importance of this revelation cannot be overestimated. No matter how diligent an editor might have been in collating various texts, or how clever and full of insight he might have been in making original emendations, his text could never be a sound one if it was based on that of an immediate or recent predecessor. Capell, however, went one step further, and in outlining his method of collation he really anticipated much modern theory about copy-text:

> Thus furnished [with as many editions as possible], he fell immediately to collation,- which is the first step in works of this nature;

> and, without it, nothing is done to purpose,- first of moderns with moderns, then of moderns with ancients, and afterwards of ancients with others more ancient: 'till, at the last, a ray of light broke forth upon him, by which he hop'd to find his way through the wilderness of these editions into that fair country the Poet's real habitation. He had not proceeded far in his collation, before he saw cause to come to this resolution;- to stick invariably to the old editions, (that is, the best of them) which hold now the place of manuscripts, no scrap of the Author's writing having the luck to come down to us; and never to depart from them, but in cases where reason, and the uniform practice of men of the greatest note in this art, tell him - they may be quitted; nor yet in those, without notice.[14]

The similarity between this theory and that enunciated by McKerrow in his Prolegomena is unmistakable.[15] For the first time, an editor of Shakespeare at least attempted to use authoritative texts of Shakespeare's plays as the basis of his own, and did not simply use a contemporary version, having no authority. By carefully examining all of the quartos in his possession, Capell arrived at a table wherein he distinguished "good" quartos from "bad" quartos. The good quartos were generally the oldest, and Capell gave special attention to those early good quartos of which the Folio text was substantially a reprint. These consisted of quarto versions of Much Ado About Nothing, Love's Labour's Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice, Richard II, I Henry IV, Titus Andronicus, and Romeo and Juliet. Also, as Alice Walker points out, "whether by good luck or good judgement he decided that the genuine 1600 quartos of A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Merchant of Venice were the 'best.' He also concluded that the quarto texts of Troilus and Cressida, Hamlet, and King Lear were superior to the Folio's, but thought the Folio the 'best' for 2 Henry IV, Richard III, and Othello."[16] It is doubtful that many would agree with all of Capell's selections, but that is not really the important issue. What is important is that Capell here broke with an almost one hundred and fifty year old tradition of using the Folio text as the ultimate basis for all of Shakespeare's plays, and only occasionally using the quartos to justify alternate readings. Where Capell printed the word "best" after a quarto in his table, he used that quarto as his copy-text. The result, as Alice Walker says, was "the restoration of hundreds of authoritative readings"; and she goes on to say that "On this account we may allow him the title of 'the Restorer of Shakespeare.'"[17] The importance of this aspect of Capell's editorial theory is summarized by Sailendra Sen as follows:

> It is the emergence of the idea of the most authoritative text consequent upon a study of the historical relationships of the various texts extant, further it is the recognition of the importance of this idea, which makes all the difference between the editorial theory of the second half of the eighteenth century and that of the first half.[18]

Capell's conception of the origin of the quarto texts is also extremely interesting and, as we shall see, anticipated much modern textual theory. Capell first of all showed how the condemnation by the Folio editors of the quarto texts (i.e. calling them "stolen and surreptitious") cannot be believed, since they very often followed the same copies that they condemned. He also attacked the then popular conception of the nature of the quartos, singling out Theobald's remarks about them for special consideration:

> A modern editor, who is not without his followers, is pleas'd to assert confidently in his preface, that they are printed from "piece-meal parts, and copies of prompters:" but his arguments for it are some of them without foundation, and the others not conclusive; and it is to be doubted, that the opinion is only thrown out to countenance

> an abuse that has been carry'd to much too
> great lengths by himself and another editor,-
> that of putting out of the text passages
> that they did not like.[19]

Capell's own view of the quartos was that the good ones were in fact printed from Shakespeare's own copies. He went to great lengths to show that the plays were of necessity hastily written, and that they were issued from "presses most of them as corrupt and licentious as can any where be produc'd, and not overseen by himself, nor by any of his friends";[20] yet, they still must contain many authoritative readings and simply to ignore them is to do Shakespeare the greatest disservice imaginable. Capell ingeniously explained Heminge's and Condell's assertion that the quartos were "stolen" and "maimed" by claiming that they were "stoln from the Author's copies, by transcribers who found means to get at them: and 'maim'd' they must needs be, in respect of their many alterations after the first performance."[21] Capell's view of the quartos obviously represents a very important step towards modern textual theory. As we saw in chapter one,[22] A.W. Pollard's vindication of the quarto texts was one of the most important steps towards the formulation of the "new bibliography," but really Capell had attempted a similar vindication some one hundred and fifty years earlier. Capell's argument, of course, was not as sophisticated as Pollard's, but when we consider the state of textual criticism in Capell's time, his achievement was indeed remarkable. In fact, in many ways Capell's argument was extremely similar to Pollard's. Pollard suggested, as Capell did, that some of the good quartos probably were printed from Shakespeare's own autograph manuscripts,[23] and, what is equally interesting, Capell attempted to support the authority of some of the quarto texts by appealing to the records of the Stationers' Register, just as Pollard did.[24] Again, Capell's argument was not nearly as subtle and refined as Pollard's, but it was nevertheless very advanced for its time. In a note meant to prove that the quartos were "fairly come by," Capell made the following point:

> There is yet extant in the books of the Stationers' Company, an entry bearing date - Febr. 12. 1624. to Messrs. Jaggard and Blount, the proprietors of this first folio, which is thus worded: "Mr. Wm. Shakespear's Comedy's History's & Tragedy's so many of the said Copy's as bee not enter'd to other men:" and this entry is follow'd by the titles of all those sixteen plays that were first printed in the folio: The other twenty plays ("Othello, and King John" excepted; which the person who furnish'd this transcript, thinks he may have overlook'd) are enter'd too in these books, under their respective years; but to whom the transcript says not.[25]

It is a shame that Capell took this argument no farther, but his anticipation of Pollard's discussion is certainly evident. Sailendra Sen's summation of Capell's achievement here is fair and accurate:

> Pollard's demonstration that the Good Quartos were all regularly entered in The Stationers' Register, and that the Bad Quartos were not, is rightly regarded as a piece of fundamental work. Capell, though not making this particular point, at least drew before Pollard the important conclusion, on an analysis of contents, that the books of the Stationers' Company are reliable.[26]

Capell firmly believed, then, that the only way an editor could ever arrive at a satisfactory text of Shakespeare's plays is first of all to decide which text of a particular play is most authoritative, and then to adhere as closely as possible to that text, deviating only when a reading is obviously corrupt, This is not to say, however, that Capell was a conservative editor. He had no delusions about the reliability of either the quarto or Folio texts, and did not hesitate to emend where he thought emendation was necessary. The picture he painted of even the "good" quartos shows that he realized just how corrupt they were. They were not only deficient in such aspects as act and scene division, stage directions, scene placements, allocation of speeches, and proper line division, but also one finds "transpositions of words, sentences, lines, and even speeches; words omitted, and others added without reason; and a punctuation so deficient, and so often wrong, that it hardly deserves regard."[27] Obviously, given this situation, one would be foolish to adhere doggedly to every single quarto reading.

Capell's picture of the texts found in the First Folio was no brighter. After having pointed out that a number of the Folio texts were simply reprints of earlier quartos, he issued the following warning:

> ... the faults and errors of the quartos are all preserv'd in the folio, and others added to them; and what difference there is, is generally for the worse on the side of the folio editors: which should give us but faint hopes of meeting with greater accuracy in the plays which they first publish'd; and, accordingly, we find them subject to all the imperfections that have been noted in the former: nor is their edition in general distinguish'd by any mark of preference above the earliest quartos, but that some of their plays are divided into acts, and some others into acts and scenes; and that with due precision, and agreeable to the Author's idea of the nature of such divisions.[28]

Given this rather depressing situation, an editor is faced with the problem of how to make intelligent emendations. Capell was well aware of the fact that the farther a text is chronologically from the earliest good edition, the more corrupt it is likely to be; and, as we can see, he had no delusions about the nature of these later quartos:

> The quarto's went through many impressions, ... and, in each play, the last is generally taken from the impression next before it, and so onward to the first; the few that come not within this rule, are taken notice of in the Table: And this further is to be observ'd of them: that, generally speaking, the more distant they are from the original, the more they abound in faults; 'till, in the end, the corruptions of the last copies become so excessive, as to make them of hardly any worth.[29]

However, he still felt that these later quartos were valuable, and in this belief he again was years ahead of his time. As we saw in chapter one, there has recently been a definite reaction against the overly conservative editorial philosophy of McKerrow, and textual critics such as Greg and Fredson Bowers have advocated a type of limited eclecticism as the only method of arriving at a satisfactory text.[30] Capell, in his use of the later quarto texts, was, in a rudimentary way, advocating the same thing. He explained his editorial technique in the following paragraph:

> Had the editions thus follow'd been printed with carefulness, from correct copies, and copies not added to or otherwise alter'd after those impressions, there had been no occasion for going any further: but this was not at all the case, even in the best of them; and it therefore became proper and necessary to look into the other old editions, and to select from thence whatever improves the Author, or contributes to his advancement in perfectness, the point in view throughout all this performance: that they do improve him, was with the editor an argument in his favour; and a presumption of genuineness for what is thus selected, whether additions or differences of any other nature; and the causes of their appearing in some copies, and being wanting in others, cannot now be discover'd, by reason of the time's distance, and defect to fit materials for making the discovery.[31]

Capell probably would have been wise to have elaborated more on his method of selecting various readings, since this explanation might leave the reader with the impression that he merely adopted a reading if he happened to like it. McKerrow, for example, interpreted Capell's remarks in this fashion, calling the introduction "the clearest exposition of the selective theory of editing - the idea that if an editor likes a reading, that reading is (a) good, and (b) attributable to Shakespeare."[32] In fact, as I have been attempting to show, Capell's introduction is a very strong reaction against this theory of editing. Unfortunately for his reputation, however, Capell did not see fit to explain his method fully at this time. As he said:

> Did the limits of his Introduction allow it, the editor would gladly have dilated and treated more at large this article of his plan; as that which is of greatest importance, and most likely to be contested of any thing in it: but this doubt, or this dissent (if any be) must come from those persons only who are not yet possess'd of the idea they ought to entertain of these ancient impressions; for of those who are, he fully persuades himself he shall have both the approof and the applause.[33]

It is not until one examines Capell's Notes that one sees that nearly all of his emendations were based on a careful analysis of the relationship between various texts; and rarely, if ever, did he select a reading simply because he liked it. In our examination of Capell's handling of The Tempest, Othello, and Romeo and Juliet we will see that there are countless instances where Capell relied on close textual and bibliographical analysis to arrive at his reading, and not personal choice.[34]

Even in instances where it was necessary for Capell to make an original emendation, his method was as fair and logical as possible. He said that he first of all consulted other modern editors to see if they could offer any worthwhile suggestions. Finding their readings often "incompetent, or else absolutely deficient,"[35] he was forced to make an original emendation. His original reading, however, was not arrived at easily, but rather was the result of his "using judgment and conjecture; which, he is bold to say, he will not be found to have exercis'd wantonly, but to follow the establish'd rules of critique with soberness and temperance."[36] He went on to say that the rejected reading is always put below, except where a longer and more complicated explanation is necessary, in which case that explanation is to be found in the Notes. The advance Capell made here is great. All previous editors had claimed to be very careful in their original emendations and in noting rejected readings, but I think it is fair to say that none had carried out this task nearly as conscientiously as Capell.

A rather unfortunate aspect of Capell's edition of Shakespeare is that he did not publish his Notes and Various Readings at the same time that he published the edition itself. The mere fact that his Notes formed several separate volumes and were not appended to the actual text probably accounted for some of the initial unpopularity of the edition, but Capell justified his decision not to publish his text and notes simultaneously by pointing out that he would soon have his "School of Shakespeare" completed, in which would be found much information that he would be referring to in the Notes. In order to avoid duplication, Capell decided to hold off publishing the Notes. Apparently, though, the completion of "The School" took a little longer than he had anticipated,[37] and the first volume of his Notes did not appear until 1774. The long delay had its predictable effect, and this volume was rather poorly received. Walker describes how Capell, discouraged by this reception, withdrew the volume, and was only later persuaded by Garrick to attempt the completion of the work.[38] An enlarged first volume was printed in 1779, and the second volume followed the year after. The subscription price for the whole was three guineas, and, to quote Pegge, "The subscription was respectable, though not numerous."[39] Capell died before all three volumes were published, and Pegge relates the following touching anecdote about Capell's final wishes.

> His attachment to the Work was so great, that, as appears by his Will, he charged his personal estate with any and every expense that might attend the publication after his decease. As he had received subscriptions in part, his honour now came in aid of his vanity; which, it must be said, was of superior consideration, great as the latter might be.[40]

The most interesting aspect of these three volumes, to the twentieth-century reader at least, is Capell's notes to the various textual problems that he encountered in Shakespeare. Although a fairly wide range of subjects is covered in these notes, by far the majority are concerned with problems in Shakespeare's text. As was previously pointed out, Capell's interest in textual matters was not generally appreciated by the eighteenth-century reader, but it need hardly be said that today we regard notes of a textual nature as an integral part of any good edition of Shakespeare.

Capell's "Various Readings," of course, also represent a large step forward in editorial technique. Their importance is clearly shown by Alice Walker:

> The Various Readings are no longer of much practical value, but they were the only record of their kind until the Cambridge Shakespeare and they marked an enormous advance, both in scope and method, on anything before. Pope, for instance, had made much use of the first

> good quarto (Q2) of Hamlet but, when he substituted in its readings for those of the Folio, he recorded the rejected readings in so haphazard a fashion that no one could tell whence the readings of his text were derived. ... Even as late as 1766, after Capell's Prolusions had set an example of methodical editing, Steevens's Twenty of the Plays of Shakespeare was not, in its apparatus, an advance on Pope's methods, for not only was the collation slapdash but it seems not to have occurred to Steevens that a reader might want to know from which quarto a given variant was derived.[41]

Capell's "School of Shakespeare," which consists of extracts taken from some of Shakespeare's possible sources, and which aid in the understanding of his language, clearly shows that Capell was well versed in a number of areas of Shakespearean scholarship. It was pointed out in chapter one that the ideal editor of Shakespeare must have an extremely wide range of knowledge,[42] and Capell certainly showed this range throughout his Notes. At the end of the second volume he appended two short essays, one dealing with the order and date of Shakespeare's plays, and the other with Shakespeare's verse. Again, Capell's range of knowledge is remarkable. Far from being the dull pedant that both eighteenth-century and modern critics have seen him as, Capell was in fact alive to all aspects of Shakespeare that might somehow be important in his editorial duties. Walker points out that Capell in effect was much more accurate in his dating of Shakespeare's plays than was Malone,[43] and yet he has not nearly the same reputation as a Shakespearean scholar.

Having said all of this, then, let us examine Capell's actual performance as an editor. As we have seen, nearly all of the previous eighteenth-century editors espoused fairly sound principles in their prefaces, and then ignored these principles in their actual work on the text. Capell, however, did no such thing. As we shall see, he almost never deviated from his stated editorial techniques, and, as a result, we have with Capell, by far the best edition of Shakespeare's text published in the eighteenth century, and perhaps the best until the twentieth century.

Capell's handling of the text of The Tempest presents a great contrast to Pope's. As we noticed in chapter three, Pope relied on Rowe's text of the play for his copy-text, and almost always followed Rowe's reading when it differed from that of the First Folic.[44] Furthermore, Pope made a rather large number of original emendations, seldom if ever concerning himself with what Shakespeare actually wrote, but rather attempting to "improve" Shakespeare's meter and grammar, or else to clarify his meaning. Occasionally Pope noted rejected readings at the bottom of the page, but for him to do so was much more the exception than the rule. Capell, on the other hand, handled the text in much the same fashion as a modern editor would. He made a number of original emendations, but in almost every case the reader was provided with the rejected reading, and in a number of instances Capell went to considerable trouble to support his emendation in his Notes. The following table will provide the reader with a clear indication of the types of original emendations that Capell made.

Analysis of Capell's Original Emendations in The Tempest

Act 1, Scene 1

1 change of position of stage direction.

1 contraction.

Act 1, Scene 2

2 alterations of wording of stage direction.
1 addition of stage direction.

1 contraction expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 1

3 additions of stage directions.
1 alteration of wording of stage directions.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 2

4 additions of stage directions.

Act 3, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 3, Scene 2

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

Act 3, Scene 3

2 additions of stage directions.

Act 4, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed ("and" to "an").

1 transposition of line order.

Act 5, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.

1 contraction expanded to two words.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Epilogue

1 addition of stage direction.

TOTALS

Total number of alterations	48
Number concerned with staging	18
Number concerned with meter	14
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	3
Number concerned with meaning	13

Capell, then, did not make a great number of original emendations in this play, and when we consider that almost a third of his emendations were concerned with stage directions, it becomes obvious that his work on the text was indeed very careful and selective. Capell never altered a reading unless he felt that he had a good reason for doing so.

Perhaps a modern editor would most often disagree with Capell over the types of alterations that he made in order to improve Shakespeare's meter. Capell, as we can see from the table, was not averse to adding or omitting a word occasionally where he felt that to do so was essential for the sake of the meter; but where he differed from previous editors was that he always made the reader aware that he was in fact altering the Folio text. For example, in Act 1, scene 2, the Folio has Miranda speak the following unmetrical line: "O good sir, I doe" (105). Capell altered the line to read "O, yes, good sir, I do," but he printed the word "yes" in Gothic type, thus immediately alerting the reader to the emendation. Similarly, when Capell omitted a word found in the Folio text in order to aid the meter of a line, the reader was made aware of the omission. In Act 1, scene 2, the Folio has Prospero say, "It goes on I see/As my soule prompts it" (486-87). Capell omitted the word "on," thus regularizing the meter; but, as usual, he printed the rejected reading at the bottom of the page. The modern editor might disagree with both these alterations, but he certainly would have to applaud Capell's methods.

Of course, Capell's most interesting emendations are those made to clarify meaning. Again, Capell nearly always provided the reader with the rejected reading at the bottom of the page,[45] and he also occasionally provided, in his Notes, a full explanation of the rationale behind his emendation. As we shall see, his emendations were nearly always based on well thought-out editorial theories and principles, and were seldom simply the result of personal preference.

One of the most interesting of these emendations occurs in Act 1, scene 2, where the Folio prints the following lines:

> I have with such provision in mine Art
> So safely ordered, that there is no soule
> No not so much perdition as an hayre
> Betid to any creature in the vessell
> Which thou heardst cry, which thou sawst sinke:...
> (35-39)

Here Capell altered the word "soule" to "loss," and explained his course of action as follows:

> The alter'd and the altering word of this sentence approach'd nearer to one another than will be judg'd from the latter's present orthography; but it's former was -loſſe and under that form might most readily be corrupted to -Soule ; that it was the reading intended, the line after is evidence; for that line is explanatory of the term that preceeded, carrying it to an excess that is not convey'd by it nakedly, as is Shakespeare's manner elsewhere. Other conjectures upon the passage are given in due place; and with them readings chosen by others that belong to two pages, the present and that before: but this should be remember'd in seeing them,- that the text intitl'd to preference, here and in other plays that are specify'd, ... is that of the first folio, where errors are not apparent; which (it is conceiv'd) is not the case of the readings which this text has adopted, to say no more of them.[46]

In this note we see Capell at both his best and his worst. The reasoning behind his emendation is certainly sound. Rather than arbitrarily attempting to twist the word "soule" into a word that he liked, Capell looked for possible sources of corruption. In other words, his motive for making the emendation was to recover what Shakespeare actually wrote. Also, he was at his best in warning his readers not to be seduced by other editors who may have devised readings that were more aesthetically pleasing. These editors, after all, were not basing their texts on any authoritative version, and therefore their readings should not be trusted. Unfortunately, the note also shows Capell at his stylistic worst. One of the major difficulties encountered in reading Capell, especially in the Notes, is that he is occasionally rather difficult to understand. His stylistic difficulties, in fact, probably were a contributing factor to the relative unpopularity of his edition. A reader accustomed to the clarity and conciseness of a Joseph Addison or a Samuel Johnson would have difficulty adjusting to Capell's manner of writing.[47]

Capell included another very interesting note to an emendation that he made in Act 2, scene 1. Here, the Folio has Antonio saying these lines:

> ... 'Twentie consciences
> That stand 'twixt me, and Millaine, candied be they,
> And melt ere they mollest:... (306-08)

Capell changed "And melt" to "Would melt," and justified the emendation in the following note:

> i.e. though they were "candy'd," and (as is the nature of hard substances pressing upon the flesh) might be expected to give me trouble, yet, sooner than do so, they "would melt:" the allusion seems a little a-kin to that in 1, 24, and very probably sprang from it. "Would," written by its abbreviation - W'd, might very easily pass into - And, with compositors who attended rarely to sense. The readers of this speech in editions following the first modern will see it otherwise broken, and alter'd silently; that addition escaping them which compleats it's first line, and the deficient hemistich passing with them for a continuance of that from Sebastian.[48]

Capell's editorial technique was certainly sound here. He supported his emendation by explaining the sense of the passage, by pointing to parallel allusions and by suggesting possible compositorial corruption. He concluded his note by pointing out the difficulties that earlier editors had with the passage due to their use of faulty copy-text. Again, the modern editor might not agree with Capell's emendation, but there can be little doubt that in editorial technique he was many years ahead of his time.

Capell also made substantial use of the emendations of other editors, but again his rationale for doing so was sound. He never accepted another editor's emendation simply because he found it aesthetically pleasing; his choices were always based on sound analysis and on a desire to recover what Shakespeare actually wrote. In consulting the other eighteenth-century editions for possible emendations, Capell proved his desire to achieve as authoritative a text as possible, and not simply to impress by the brilliance of his own conjectures. Capell realized that the other editors were clever men, and if they had a valid suggestion for an emendation, so much the better.

Where Capell differed somewhat from modern editors was in his method of incorporating emendations from other editions into his own text. Today, of course, the good editor is very scrupulous about acknowledging the origin of any emendation he might adopt, but Capell felt that such acknowledgement was unimportant. He did clearly signify where an emendation was made, and he did print the rejected reading at the bottom of the page, but he only acknowledged the source of his emendation in his Notes. He explained his reason for this as follows:

> In the manuscripts from which all these plays are printed, the emendations are given to their proper owners by initials and other marks that are in the margin of those manuscripts; but they are suppress'd in the print for two reasons: First, their number, in some pages, makes them a little unsightly; and the editor professes himself weak enough to like a well-printed book: in the next place, he does declare - that his only object has been, to do service to his great Author; which provided it be done, he thinks it of small importance by what hand the service

> was administer'd: If the partisans of former editions shall chance to think them injur'd by this suppression, he must upon this occasion violate the rules of modesty, by declaring - that he himself is the most injur'd by it; whose emendations are equal, at least in number, to all theirs if put together; to say nothing of his recover'd readings, which are more considerable still.[49]

Admirable as it may be to have a nicely printed edition, and true as it may be that if an emendation helps to recover Shakespeare from corruption, its source is of little real importance, there can be no doubt that this lack of acknowledgement is a somewhat regrettable feature of Capell's edition. Even today it is interesting to see exactly where clever emendations first came from, and, in the eighteenth century, where each editor took such pride in the brilliance of his own conjectures, Capell's lack of acknowledgement must have contributed to the unpopularity of the edition.[50]

It is interesting to notice the types of emendations that Capell accepted from the earlier editions. As we would expect, the majority of the emendations that he accepted from the three folios and Rowe's edition are concerned with grammatical problems and with the modernization or correction of the First Folio's spelling. When we come to Pope's text we notice, again as we might expect, that the majority of the emendations that Capell accepted have to do with the regularizing of Shakespeare's meter. Theobald, in contrast to Pope, prided himself on his ability to clarify obscure lines, and most of the emendations that Capell accepted from his edition are concerned with meaning. The following table shows exactly how Capell made use of the various "unauthoritative" versions of The Tempest.

Analysis of Capell's Use of Editions Other than F1 in The Tempest.

Folios 2, 3, & 4

1 contraction.
2 words added to improve meter.
1 word changed to improve meter.
7 words changed to improve grammar.
6 words changed to clarify meaning.
12 words changed to modernize or correct spelling.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 30

Rowe

1 stage direction.
1 word added to clarify meaning.
2 words omitted to improve meter.
1 word omitted for non-metrical reasons.
1 word changed to improve meter.
7 words changed to improve grammar.
5 words changed to clarify meaning.
3 words changed to modernize or correct spelling.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 21

Pope

2 stage directions.
5 contractions.
2 words added to improve meter.
1 word omitted to improve meter.
2 words changed to improve meter.
1 word changed to improve grammar.
2 words changed to clarify meaning.
2 lines transposed.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 17

Theobald

2 stage directions.
2 words added to improve meter.
1 word omitted to improve meter.
1 word changed to improve grammar.
6 words changed to clarify meaning.
1 change of speech assignment.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 13

Hanmer

1 stage direction.
1 contraction.
1 word added to improve meter.
1 word omitted for non-metrical reasons.
2 words changed to clarify meaning.
1 word changed to modernize or correct spelling.
1 change of word order.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 8

Warburton

2 words changed to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 2

Total adoptions from editions other than F1 = 91
Total original adaptations = 48
Number of times Capell's edition differs from F1 = 139

The most interesting emendations here certainly are those which Capell explained in his Notes, since it is through these that the reader can fully appreciate Capell's editorial techniques. One very revealing example of the care that Capell took in accepting another editor's conjecture occurs in Act 1, scene 2, where he partially accepted Rowe's alterations in the following lines spoken by Caliban: "... when thou cam'st first / Thou stroakst me, & made much of me..." (392-93). Rowe emended these lines to"... when thou camest first/ Thou stroak'dst me, and made much of me...," thus correcting both Shakespeare's meter and his grammar. Capell's reaction to this is most interesting. He accepted Rowe's change of "stroakest" to "stroak'dst," but rejected his alteration of "cam'st" to "camest." His note reads as follows:

> The plain grammar mistakes of the line following struck the modern spoken of last [Rowe], and their cure is from him; but of a beauty resulting from it he should not have been conscious, nor others after him (for he is follow'd in all) by their making *camest* of "cam'st" in the line quoted, for the sole purpose of having regular measure; a motive that induc'd his next successor (and he too is follow'd) to make of "*would't had*" - *I would it had*, in 31. of his page: The lines severally refer'd to, and above all the second, are the most adapted to character of any throughout the play; their contractions, and the harshness resulting from them, giving them this preheminence: and it is of them probably, and others their like, that that observation arose from some great men concerning Caliban's language, which is recorded in Shakespeare's "Life" where this play is spoke of;- and, for the sentiment,- every speech that is given him abounds in strokes of the horrid, the uncouth, the savage, and all those beauties which have made the "Cyclops" of Theocritus the admiration of all ages.[51]

The care that Capell took here is obvious. Rather than simply accepting both of Rowe's emendations, which would have been the simplest thing for him to do, he restored a reading from the Folio which had been absent for some sixty years. He restored the reading simply because he could find no justifiable reason for altering it. Certainly, it makes Shakespeare's line less metrical, but, as Capell rightly pointed out, Caliban, of all of Shakespeare's characters, should not be expected to speak metrically. Here, of course, we see Capell breaking away from the eighteenth-century insistance that Shakespeare's text be as regular as possible; Capell was much more concerned with getting back to what Shakespeare actually wrote.

In chapter three it was mentioned that in his handling of the Folio's reading "Most busie lest" (III.i.17), Pope was greatly removed from modern editorial technique.[52] All Pope did was rearrange and change Shakespeare's words so as to make some sense of them. The fact that his altered reading could not have possibly emanated from Shakespeare was unimportant to him. It is interesting to see how Capell dealt with the same line. Rather than posit an original emendation, Capell accepted Theobald's reading ("Most busy-less"), and justified his action by an examination of the meaning of the line:

> A change of the third modern's, which has a better foundation than he knew of; for, when he made it, he should not have seen the first folio notwithstanding his round assertion. But the help which this correction administers goes but very small way towards a full conception of the passage at large, which begins - "I forget:" a paraphrase must do it, which take in these words;- I talk, and quite forget my task: Yet I will think of her too: for those sweet thoughts lighten my work; and when I am most employ'd in it, thinking of her I scarce feel that I'm employ'd in't at all; am least engag'd by my business (most unengag'd by it) when engag'd by such thinking:- The sentiment, 'twill be allow'd, is most natural; but that the expressions convey it properly, no favourer of the poet will have the hardiness to assert in good earnest.[53]

Notwithstanding Furness's rather snide (but unfortunately accurate) comment that "It is fortunate for us that after one of Capell's paraphrases we always have the original to go to,"[54] one must admit that Capell's editorial technique here deserves praise. His primary reason for accepting Theobald's emendation was that it is close to the Folio reading, and hence might be what Shakespeare actually wrote. His attempt to make sense of the passage is valiant, and his concession that the line must ultimately be regarded as being rather weak is in accordance with modern editorial opinion.[55] The advance that Capell shows here over Pope's editorial methods must surely be obvious to everyone.

One aspect of Capell's editorial work which tends to be overlooked, but which is certainly one of his most important contributions to Shakespearean scholarship, is that he restored literally thousands of original readings to Shakespeare's text. Again, one must consult his Notes to see his editorial methods in action; indeed, many of the notes in which he justified the retention of an original reading show just how advanced his editorial technique really was.

In Act 1, scene 2, for example, the Folio has Ariel say, "Not a soule/ But felt a Feaver of the madde, ... (243-44). Rowe, in his second edition, followed Dryden's lead and changed the word "madde" to "mind," and he was followed in this emendation by Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, and Warburton. Capell, however, argued for a return of the original reading:

> Singular as this expression will seem, there is cause enough for retaining it; or, at the least, for not giving into that alteration of it which has been made by some moderns, ... which is even foolish it's connexion consider'd with what immediately ushers it: Possibly, it was the Poet's first word, coin'd in haste; and the consideration above caus'd the change of it into a term that is hazarded, but has it's force and propriety, importing - "of the mad species," that has the strongest and the strangest deliriums; such as that "fever" has which is intitl'd - a calenture, and is peculiar to seafaring.[56]

The wisdom of Capell's restoration is immediately apparent. Unlike his predecessors, who took the easy course of changing what they did not understand, Capell was not ready to sacrifice a reading from his copy-text if no sacrifice was necessary. Of course, editors from Pope on might have made the restoration had they been using the Folio text as the basis of their own, but unfortunately their versions were all ultimately based on Rowe's. Capell's anticipation of modern copy-text theory and his superior knowledge of Shakespeare's use of language, then, proved extremely beneficial to him here.

One final example of Capell's restoration of an authoritative reading should be sufficient to show how greatly superior his editorial technique was to that of previous editors. The Folio has Prospero open Act 4, scene 1, with the following lines:

> If I have too austerly punish'd you,
> Your compensation makes amends, for I
> Have given you here, a third of mine owne life,
> Or that for which I live ... (3-6)

This reading was accepted by both Rowe and Pope, but was questioned by Theobald, who claimed that Prospero, being a widower, would call Miranda a half of himself, and not a third. Basing his argument on the fact that the words "third" and "thrid" were nearly identical in form and punctuation, Theobald altered "third" to "thread," and he was supported in this alteration by many subsequent editors. Capell, however, argued against the emendation as follows:

> a third of mine own life,) If what follows these words in way of explaining had been reflected on thoroughly, that correction of "*third*" to which we have given place in the *Readings* had never been fallen-in with so readily as we see it is in editors and their remarkers; for that poetical *thread* of the fates' spinning, is not what we live "*for*," but what we live *by*: we must cast about then for a sense of this term - *third*, that shall co-incide with it's comment; and, unless the writer deceives himself, there is one offers that not only does that, but withal honours the Poet's judgment in using this term. Princes have a tye upon life more than others, and it is perhaps their first tye: the individual, and his off-spring, are next it; but the prince who has a sense of his duty,

> will think his realm his first care, and the better third of his life:- and this is Prospero's sense of his life-attachments; his concerns here, the matters his life consists of, are- his realm's benefit, his daughter's happiness, and his own conservation: the daughter he gives away, keeping all his concern for her, the realm he hop'd to return to, and resume care of that; and when return'd to it, when retir'd to his Milan, then (as he tells us in almost his last speech, p. 77.) Every third thought should be his grave; words that seem to derive themselves from the expression in this passage.[57]

In chapter one it was pointed out that W.W. Greg considered the ability to detect where "explanation becomes impossible and alteration of the text necessary" to be "the fine flower of criticism, and few attain it."[58] Capell, through his most plausible explanation of the original text, has here succeeded where many other editors have failed. Frank Kermode, editor of the New Arden Tempest, says of this issue that "... the words third and thrid were so nearly identical in form and pronunciation that the strongest argument for third is merely that it makes better sense."[59] Capell, then, was quite right in attempting to explain the meaning of "third," and, at least in this instance, he far outdid the greatest eighteenth-century elucidator of Shakespeare's text, Samuel Johnson. Johnson did adhere to the Folio's "third," but he gave no explanation for doing so. All he said was, "Prospero in his reason subjoined why he calls her the third of his life, seems to allude to some logical distinction of causes, making her the final cause."[60] It is interesting to note that Furness, after giving some fifteen different interpretations of the line, concludes by saying, "The true interpretation, it seems to me, is Capell's."[61]

Naturally, it is in his handling of the text of a play where early quarto versions do exist that Capell's advanced editorial technique becomes most apparent. We noticed in chapter three that Pope made extensive use of the 1622 quarto of Othello, but we also noticed that he used the quarto primarily as a source from which to draw aesthetically pleasing readings, and he was generally not concerned with the possibility of recovering Shakespeare's actual wording. Capell, as we shall see, made even more extensive use of this quarto than Pope did, but in Capell's handling of it we at least begin to see the type of limited eclecticism that is so much in favour today.

Capell in fact possessed three early quarto texts of Othello, the 1622 version as well as the text published in 1630 (Q2), and that published in 1655 (Q3). Although he made use of all three versions, he chose to use the text printed in the First Folio as his copy-text. As we can see from the following table, however, he made liberal use of the quarto versions in his possession.

Analysis of Capell's Use of Qq of Othello

Act 1, Scene 1

1 contraction expanded to two words.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

7 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
7 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 1, Scene 2

1 contraction expanded to two words.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 1, Scene 3

1 addition of stage direction.

1 contraction.
1 contraction expanded to two words.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
4 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

8 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
9 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
14 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 1

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.
1 alteration of placement of stage direction.

1 contraction.
2 contractions expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

6 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
13 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 2

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

2 contractions.
2 contractions expanded to two words.

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

8 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
8 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
20 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

2 reversals of word order.

Act 3, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.

Act 3, Scene 3

4 contractions.
5 contractions expanded to two words.

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

10 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

7 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.

6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
11 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
34 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 4

2 alterations of wording of stage directions.

2 contractions.
4 contractions expanded to two words.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

7 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
9 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.
1 alteration of placement of stage direction.

1 contraction.
2 contractions expanded to two words.

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
12 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 2

1 contraction.
1 contraction expanded to two words.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
15 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 3

2 contractions expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

8 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize to correct spelling.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

2 contractions.
2 contractions expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 2

2 additions of stage directions.
2 alterations of wording of stage directions.

2 contractions.
3 contractions expanded to form two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
12 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

TOTALS

Number of times Capell follows Qq	425
Number concerned with staging	15
Number concerned with spelling or modernization	68
Number concerned with grammar	55
Number concerned with meter	108
Number concerned with meaning	170
Number for other reasons	9

Capell's Use of Q2 (1630)

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 contraction.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

5 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

13 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
10 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS FROM Q2 = 38

Capell's Use of Q3 (1655)

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed to modernize or correct spelling.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify
meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS FROM Q3 = 6

It might be seen from this table that Capell, if anything, was even more prone than Pope to introducing readings from his quartos if he happened to like them, since he did in fact accept quarto readings some three times more often than Pope. His extensive use of the quartos, however, does not show Capell going against his own editorial principles. Many of his choices might be rejected by the modern editor who chooses to use the Folio as copy-text, but Capell's motives for adopting quarto reading were, for the most part at least, sound.

One begins to realize that Capell was not simply selecting attractive readings from the quarto texts in a haphazard fashion when one consults his Notes. Here we see, in the unfortunately few places where he chose to justify his selections of quarto readings, that his choices were based on a careful analysis of the text and a desire to recover Shakespeare's actual wording. Capell was never one to slip over a textual problem, and when he found an unintelligible reading in his copy-text he invariably went to the quartos and the other editors for help, or he resorted to original emendation.[62] A very revealing example of Capell's editorial technique is found in Act 3, scene 4, where the Folio has Cassio speak the following lines at the end of a speech to Desdemona:

> So shall I cloath me in a forc'd content,
> And shut my selfe up in some other course
> To Fortunes Almes. (140-42)

These lines are obviously somewhat obscure, and yet no eighteenth-century editor (with the exception of Johnson, whose edition Capell had not seen) had bothered to alter them in any way.[63] Capell, however, made a valiant effort at restoring the lines by altering the Folio's "shut" to Q1's "shoote," and by emending the Folio's "up" to read "upon." His justification for this action in the *Notes* is very interesting:

> Never did sober writer express himself as Shakespeare has been made to do hitherto, with *shut* for "*shoot*," (a word of the first quarto) and what is seen at the page's bottom for - "*upon*;" putting *upon* a course has been heard of, but shutting-up *in* one never:- What follows in the hemistitch, seems to have been a phrase in old time expressing absolute derelection; Regan throws it in the teeth of her sister at 13, l. of "*k.L*;" and we had something a like phrase in the present play, at the bottom of 63: Cassio's sense in it, in conjunction with what preceded is - that he would throw himself upon fortune, and soon, (for such is the force of - *shoot*) for a subsistence some other way.[64]

Whether we agree with Capell's reasoning here or not we cannot dispute his methods. He made his choice of the quarto reading after much consideration and obviously after much difficulty in making sense of the line. His emendation of "on" to "upon" is reasonable, if not immediately acceptable; and he attempted to support his reading by referring to parallel passages both in *Othello* and in *King Lear*. In this instance, then, Capell showed himself to be conscientious and intelligent, and to be anything but the sort of purely eclectic editor so often associated with the entire eighteenth century.

In Act 4, scene 1, Capell provided the reader with another interesting justification for his acceptance of a quarto reading. Othello, misinterpreting Cassio's reaction to Iago's question about his marrying

Bianca, says, in the Folio, "So, so, so, so: they laugh, that winnes" (141). All eighteenth-century editors up to the time of Capell handled this line in the same manner. They deleted two of the "so's" and improved Shakespeare's grammar by altering "winnes" to "win." What they were left with, then, was a perfectly regular and grammatical line; just the sort of line that they all so cherished. Capell, however, was the first editor to accept the line as it appears in Q1 ("so, so, so, so: Laugh, that wins"), and he justified his choice as follows: "What is given to Othello at 7. is by all of them read after the folio, converting 'wins' into win; conciseness is of the essence of such sayings as that speech ends with."[65] Again, we see the eighteenth-century desire for regularity and good grammar being overshadowed by Capell's desire to restore Shakespeare's text.

Some of the instances where Capell rejected a quarto reading in favour of one in the Folio are equally revealing of his editorial technique. At the beginning of Act 5, scene 1, for example, the Folio has Iago make the following reference to Roderigo: "I have rub'd this yong Quat almost to the sense" (14). Q1 reads "gnat" instead of "quat," and, although the reference would seem to be a rather strange one, both Pope and Warburton accepted this reading. Theobald emended the word to "knot," Hanmer to "quab," and Upton to "quail"; but, as Capell proved, all of these emendations were unnecessary. In the Glossary at the beginning of the first volume of his Notes, Capell defined "quat" as "a provincial Word, signifying - a Boyl or Sore on the Hand or other Member of the Body."[66] He included the following note explaining the use of the word at this particular place in Othello:

> Admitting "quat" in the sense the Glossary puts on it, there cannot be a doubt of the word's genuineness, what is predicated of it being so apparently applicable to a thing of that sort: the simile has allusion to the mood of the person spoke of; and not his figure, or qualities, as alterers have conceited;... gnat has the elder quarto's authority, but is probably a corruption:....[67]

The wisdom of giving precedence to the Folio's reading is, of course, immediately apparent when one understands the meaning of "quat," and hence we have another instance where Capell's superior knowledge of Elizabethan English helped him in his editing of Shakespeare. It is interesting to note that Ridley, in the New Arden Othello, an edition which, as we have seen, accepts a great number of quarto readings, in this case agrees with Capell (and in fact all important editors since) in accepting the Folio's "quat."[68]

In the same note, Capell condemned the modern editor's acceptance of a quarto reading for an earlier line in the same scene. In the Folio, Iago utters the following line of encouragement to Roderigo: "Heere, at thy hand: Be bold, & take thy stand" (V.i.10). The quarto reads "sword" for "stand," and this reading was accepted by Pope, Theobald, Hanmer and Warburton. Capell's note on the folly of his fellow editors is fascinating:

> .... take thy sword is not a phrase for that place: moderns have fallen-in with it, for the only sake of avoiding what is indeed a fault - the concurrence of divers words of like sound. Othello's entry with them (102, 16) is "at a Window above," meaning doubtless his Castle's; which tallies wonderfully with what is said to Emelia at 106, 12, besides other objections: and to understand the scene's action, there is want of other and better directions than are given in their copies.[69]

For Capell, the merit of Shakespeare's poetry was not enough reason for accepting or rejecting a given reading. He agreed with his fellow editors that, poetically speaking, the quarto reading is superior to that of the Folio; but Shakespeare, after all, was a dramatist as well as a poet. Whether we agree with Capell's decision to accept the Folio reading in preference to the quarto (Ridley does not), we must admit that his acceptance of the reading for dramatic reasons, and not simply poetic, represents a great advance in editorial theory.

The most important aspect of Capell's use of the quarto edition of Othello, however, is that he was really the first editor who attempted to ascertain the bibliographical relationships existing between the various editions. His work in this area might have been rudimentary, but nevertheless one can clearly see the beginnings of the "new bibliography" in what he said about these early quarto editions. In a note to a passage in Act 2, scene 1, Capell gave the reader some idea of his notion of the origin of the quarto text. In the Folio, Cassio concludes a speech in praise of Desdemona by describing her as follows:

> One that excels the quirkes of Blazoning pens,
> And in th' essentiall Vesture of Creation,
> Do's tyre the Ingeniver. (73-75)

Q1 concludes the speech by replacing the final line with "beare all excellency," and this reading was accepted by all eighteenth-century editors from Pope to Capell. Capell, however, saw this line as being very weak, and chose to keep the Folio reading, emending "Ingeniver" to "Inventor." His reason for doing so is extremely interesting:

> The facility of coining "Ingeniver" out of the word amending, need not be pointed out: it stood probably in the copy from which the quarto was publish'd, a copy pirated from

> the playhouse; the publisher went roundly to work with it; and that poor sentence, void of climax and prose-like, which moderns have taken from him, was his mode of amending it.[70]

Here, then, we see Capell concerning himself with the origins of the various texts from which he was working, and choosing his readings accordingly. An even more startling example of this same sort of editorial technique is found when we look at Capell's examination of Desdemona's song near the end of Act 4, scene 3. The song, omitted completely in Q1, was restored in the Folio and is also found in the 1630 quarto, with readings that Capell knew to be superior to those of the Folio. For the first line of the song, for example, the Folio has, "The poore Soule sat singing, by a Sicamour tree" (47). Capell, who had acquired an independent version of the song, knew that Q2's reading of "sighing" for "singing" was likely correct, and this led him to speculate upon the nature of the two quartos. The following note on Desdemona's song surely must be seen as an anticipation of modern editorial technique:

> ... Her song, the curious are wish'd to look at in a place refer'd-to before; (v. a Note to p. 41) they will find it of great difference from what is found in these pages, and admire something the Poet's judgment in molding it; his stanza is longer as well as otherwise different, it's limits mark'd in this copy; a second is but begun upon; and what comes after that line, should be part of some other song (not discover'd as yet) which went to the same tune.- Among other large deductions and numerous, mark'd in the "V.R.," is that of this whole song by the first quarto; a circumstance which induces the editor to think it pyrated from some stage-copy that was abridg'd for convenience: the quarto next in succession, for these abridg'd passages mostly went to the folio, which it sometimes improves; visibly

> in a term of the song's first line, which will
> be judg'd a corruption, though moderns are
> pleas'd to follow it.[71]

We see here for the first time an editor attempting to recover Shakespeare's original text by using what is often thought of as being a purely modern method; the ascertaining of the various interrelationships of extant texts. Alice Walker also notices Capell's great advance in editorial technique here, and summarizes his achievement as follows:

> ... what he was working towards was, in fact, an eclecticism which depended on reasoned conclusions about the interrelationship of editions, and in this respect his methods were new and anticipated the eclecticism of today.[72]

Anyone considering himself to be Shakespeare's restorer would not look kindly upon the sorts of cuts that were regularly made in Shakespeare's text by his eighteenth-century editors. Capell's revulsion from this habit of his fellow editors is most apparent in some of his notes to Romeo and Juliet. As we saw in chapter three, Pope made extensive cuts in this play, occasionally justifying his action by pointing out that the first quarto did not contain the lines, but more frequently simply omitting the lines because he did not happen to approve of them. Capell, of course, strongly condemned both of these practices. Let us briefly look at some of his notes where his condemnation is most evident.[73]

Pope, in his handling of Romeo and Juliet, chose to omit two of the first four lines of Act 1. The play begins with the following dialogue between Gregory and Sampson:

> Sam. Gregory, on my word, we'll not carry coals.
> Gre. No, for then we should be colliers.
> Sam. I mean, an we be in choler, we'll draw.
> Gre. Ay, while you live, draw your neck out o' the collar.
> Sam. I strike quickly, being moved. (1-5)

Pope, no doubt upset by Shakespeare's punning, chose to omit the third and fourth lines of this dialogue, without providing the reader with any indication that he had done so. Capell made his disapproval of this practice evident in his Notes:

> The first speaker's punning explanation in l. 6. of his phrase - "carry coals," has a punning reply to it: the explanation agrees with that in the "Glossary;" to which might have been added, in full proof of it, that the phrase rises out of a proverbial expression,- conceal'd anger is a coal of fire in the bosom: Both speeches are vanish'd out of the copies of those gentlemen, whose distaste for conceits is so very extraordinary that they neither stop to consider times nor occasions nor the characters they come from; nor yet the context's disfigurement, which, among their numerous rootings-out in this play, few (if any) ever fail of occasioning.[74]

Capell probably had no more liking for Shakespeare's puns than Pope did, but he realized that his task as editor was to reproduce Shakespeare's text as accurately as possible, and not to be swayed by his own aesthetic judgment of particular lines.

Capell's feelings on this matter are made even clearer in a note to Act 2, scene 4, where Pope and Hanmer relegated lines 40-90 to the bottom of the page, as being unworthy of Shakespeare. Capell also did not greatly approve of the wit found in the lines, but surely, he argued, their obvious genuineness should be enough to keep them in the text:

> The ommitted part's wit is not greatly to be applauded; neither is it very much short of what we have from the same speaker, Mercutio, before and after: Romeo's share of it shews him in a new light, and one that he is no where else seen in,- a match for the other's best in his own way; his cause of being so, lying in his newly-rais'd spirits from what had happen'd: This last consideration alone should have repriev'd it: but when we add it's authentickness, (which appears

> on the face of it) and it's great and open necessity for producing fit junction, we cannot but stand amaz'd at that criticism which has thought omission permissible.[75]

Capell was equally condemnatory of Pope and the editors who followed his lead in using the first quarto as an excuse for omitting lines that they did not like. Again, in his treatment of this quarto Capell was years ahead of his time; and he went to a great deal of trouble to discover the source of the quarto and to decipher exactly how it related to the other texts. His considered opinion of the quarto was that it was nothing more than "a first imperfect sketch" of the play, and as such the editor had to be extremely careful in its use. To justify wholesale omissions from the text because the lines did not appear in the first quarto was, to Capell, ridiculous. In fact, as he showed in the following note to I.i. 79-96, lines which Pope and Hanmer omitted completely, their absence from the first quarto is oftentimes a mark of their authenticity:

> An editor may have just cause enough to be displeas'd with lady Capulet's speech in p. 18, which is scarcely sense in some parts of it, but has no right to sink it: it's not being in the first quarto, which seems to have been thought an authority by one who has done it, is rather cause of forbearance, for the adding shews opinion of something having been wanted to back the mother's proposal; and the opinion is just, but it may be wish'd notwithstanding,- that this added something had been a strain or two better:...[77]

Again, Capell might not like what Shakespeare says in these lines, but nevertheless he performed the editor's duty of assessing the interrelationships between various texts, and governed his editing practices accordingly.

Capell perhaps was closest to modern editorial technique in a note to III.iii.40-43, where he did in fact omit some lines from the text. However, whereas Pope's omissions, along with those of other eighteenth-century editors, were based purely on aesthetic grounds, Capell's were based on his conception of the relationship between various texts. The passage in question is indeed a most confusing one, since it is printed differently in the Folio, the first quarto, and in other quartos. The first quarto omits several lines from the Folio and later quartos.

> But Romeo may not, he is banished.
> Flies may doo this, but I from this must flye.

Pope and Hanmer accepted these lines, with some alteration. Rowe, Theobald, Warburton and Johnson, however, accepted the Folio reading.

> This may Flies doe, when I from this must flie,
> And saist thou yet, that exile is not death?
> But Romeo may not, hee is banished.

Second and subsequent quartos, however, present a slightly different version:

> This may flyes do, when I from this must flie,
> And sayest thou yet, that exile is not death?
> But Romeo may not, he is banished.
> Flies may do this, but I from this must flie:
> They are freemen, but I am banished.

Capell took what might seem at first glance to be a rather peculiar course here. He omitted the first three lines of Q2's version, and printed, intact, the last two. His reasoning behind this tactic, however, is most revealing:

> There was small occasion for making this over-fanciful speech worse than 'tis; yet this have editors contriv'd, and the folio ones first. The period we are at present upon, has, in quarto's, a conclusion of five lines, the two preserv'd in this copy being last of the five; the others are in the "Readings;" and who shall look at them there, will see plainly - that the

> preserv'd two were form'd out of them, and that parent and child cannot subsist together; The truth is,- the latter were second thoughts of the poet, and their original was meant for expunction; but by a negligence similar to that in "Richard the Second" at 17,7. both his drafts were left standing, and so got into print: the copyers of which print in the folio, just discover'd the fitness of keeping only one draft; but (as in the other example) chose the worst, and their choice is adher'd to.[78]

Obviously, Capell carefully considered the various relationships between the texts and based his reading on these relationships. It does not matter that most modern editors probably would not agree with his final conclusion. What is important is that Capell's method was essentially similar to that of the modern editor.[79]

Although Capell has the distinction of being one of the very few who refused to engage in the pointless and silly bickering that took place among eighteenth-century editors, he still could not hide his contempt for the type of editing practices employed by his contemporaries, and most especially by Pope. What seemed to annoy Capell most was Pope's practice in Romeo and Juliet of occasionally justifying an omission or alteration in his text by referring to the first quarto, when in reality Pope omitted or altered whatever he wanted. Capell no doubt considered this to be pseudo-scholarship of the worst sort; and his indignation finally broke out in a note near the end of the play. His rationale for the note reads as follows:

> ... comparison was not the cause of producing it; the inducement to that was - that it gave occasion, now at the piece's end, to put the critical reader upon remarking that gentleman's method in modelling things to his fancy so frequently as he has done:- this is from the old edition, and this is not in the old edition, are for ever occurring in him; when the lines he gives us from thence, are given as are those

> of this passage, (often worse) alter'd and partially; and the lines or speeches displac'd by him are in parts of this tragedy where that copy of his is a meer skeleton and has scarce the form of the true one: But words can ill convey a conception of the unfairness of his proceding, and those who have follow'd him in all it's extent: collation must do it; and, to that end, it were expedient that copies of this his quarto were multiplied by reprinting: and when that was doing, the other plays of this Author which stand in the same predicament with this "Romeo and Juliet" of 1597,- as his "Henry the Fifth" of 1600; his "Contention of York and Lancaster" of the same year; his "Merry Wives of Windsor" of 1602; and his "Taming of the Shrew" of 1607, if it can be had, - should be reprinted likewise: a few impressions will serve, and a small volume hold them, but they should be given with all exactness.[80]

Capell could not have articulated the major problem with Pope's editorial technique any more clearly, and indeed, as we have seen, the underlying problem was one that plagued all eighteenth-century editors up to Capell. They all diligently collated their early quartos, and they all took painstaking care in collating their texts accurately; but unfortunately, having done all this, they had no idea of how to use their accumulated material. Capell was a vastly superior editor to his contemporaries in many ways, but where he especially outdistanced all other eighteenth-century editors was in the fact that he was the first to attempt to discover exactly how the various texts of a particular play related to one another; in other words, he was the first to attempt to restore Shakespeare's text by logical and systematic editorial technique.

To say this, of course, is not to discount the importance of the pioneering work of men such as Pollard, McKerrow and Greg. Capell's methods, as stated previously, were at best simple and rudimentary by today's standards. However, we can see a light of insight appearing in

Capell's edition, a light that was obviously badly needed in the darkness which shrouded most eighteenth-century editorial technique. It was Capell's misfortune that the glimmer of light which emanated from his edition of Shakespeare was to be almost totally extinguished in the nineteenth century, and that it is only now that he is being rightfully accorded the title that he so desperately wanted during his lifetime, "The Restorer of Shakespeare."

Chapter V

Conclusion

In Malone's preface to his 1790 edition of Shakespeare, one finds what is perhaps the fairest estimation possible of the accomplishments of Shakespeare's eighteenth-century editors:

> The succession of editors ... has made [Shakespeare] understood; it has made him popular; it has shown every one who is capable of reading, how much superior he is not only to Jonson and Fletcher, whom the bad taste of the last age from the time of the Restoration to the end of the century set above him, but to all the dramatick poets of antiquity.... Every author who pleases must surely please more as he is more understood, and there can be no doubt that Shakespeare is now infinitely better understood than he was in the last century.

One of the primary goals of this dissertation has been to show that many of the charges which have been levelled against these editors stem from a misunderstanding or an ignorance of the circumstances under which they were working. It is, of course, easy to criticize the editorial techniques employed by all of the editors up to Johnson; but in doing so it is equally easy to forget the state of the text with which they were working, and the specialized needs and demands of the reading public of the time. As we have seen, Shakespeare's text was in a state of almost complete chaos at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Few early editions of his plays were available, and next to nothing was known about the origins and nature of any of these early editions. Furthermore, we must constantly keep in mind the fact that the early eighteenth-century editor was attempting to introduce Shakespeare to an audience that was ignorant of, and generally hostile to, Shakespeare's language. Also, the early eighteenth-century theatre-goer had little or no opportunity of ever seeing a Shakespearean play performed as it was originally written, since adaptations had all but replaced Shakespeare's own works on the stage. Surely, what was most needed during this period was someone who would assist the eighteenth-century reader in understanding and appreciating Shakespeare, and this is what the early editors, each in his own way, attempted to accomplish.

Given the situation that confronted the early eighteenth-century editors, then, it is little wonder that their editorial techniques did not conform to modern practices. However, to condemn all of the editors of the eighteenth century because of the "faulty" techniques of the earlier ones is both ridiculous and unfair. As we have seen, all of the editors espoused fairly sound editorial principles in their prefaces, and with the editions of Capell and Malone we encounter some extremely sophisticated editorial philosophy.

The accomplishments of Edward Capell are especially remarkable. As we saw in the last chapter, Capell's anticipation of the modern theory of copy-text, his investigations into the nature and origins of early quarto and folio editions, and most of all his limited eclectic method of handling Shakespeare's text, all contribute to make his edition of Shakespeare one of the most important scholarly works ever published. What is perhaps most important about Capell's edition, however, is that it initiated a whole new attitude towards Shakespeare's text. Even though every previous eighteenth-century editor had claimed to be concerned with restoring Shakespeare's original text, every one of them had felt obliged to emend frequently because of what they considered to be the corrupt nature of the early quartos and folios. Capell was the first to show that the only way one could ever arrive at an accurate text of Shakespeare's plays was by a careful adherence to these early editions. This is not to say that Capell was completely opposed to original emendations or to selecting readings from various texts for his own edition. However, the emendations and selections were now based on a carefully developed textual theory concerning the inter-relationships of texts; personal preference was no longer important. Although Capell's theories were anything but popular during his lifetime, they were to form the basis of a whole new philosophy of editing Shakespeare. "Improving" Shakespeare's text was no longer to be the goal of the editor; restoration now became all important.

Today we generally tend to regard Edmond Malone as the greatest Shakespearean editor of the eighteenth century, and indeed in some respects he deserves this praise. He certainly clarified many of Capell's more obscure ideas, and, in a style that is both scholarly and precise, he probably did more than any other editor to implant the notion that Shakespeare's texts were to be reverenced, not altered. However, the fact that Malone was responsible for so much wrong thinking about the nature of some of the quarto texts published after the First Folio does much to lessen the importance of his edition. It should be apparent by now that in almost all respects Capell was the eighteenth-century editor whose technique most closely approximated those which are so popular today. The revelations of Pollard, Greg, McKerrow and Bowers certainly should not be underestimated. The wealth of textual knowledge about Shakespeare's plays that has been contributed by these men in the twentieth century is astonishing. However, I think we do tend to forget that much of what they have said in this century, and for which they have rightfully received so much acclaim, was in fact stated in rudimentary form some one hundred and forty years earlier by one of our most unjustly neglected Shakespearean scholars and editors, Edward Capell.

Footnotes

Chapter One

[1] R.B. McKerrow, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), p.6.

[2] Warburton did not rely on Hanmer's edition, which was universally recognized as corrupt and played little part in the history of eighteenth-century editing. He rather made extensive use of Theobald's edition, and some use of Pope's.

[3] R.B. McKerrow, *The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors, 1709-1768* (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), p. 19.

[4] See McKerrow, *Prolegomena*, pp.6-18.

[5] Ibid., p.8.

[6] W.W. Greg, "McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered," *RES*, 17 (1941), 139-49.

[7] W.W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography*, 3 (1950), rpt. in *Bibliography and Textual Criticism: English and American Literature 1700 to the Present*, ed. O.M. Brack Jr. and Warner Barnes (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969), p.54.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Greg, "McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered," 143.

[10] Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," p.51.

[11] Fredson Bowers, "Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an Illustration from Dryden," *Modern Philology*, 68(1950), rpt. in *Bibliography and Textual Criticism: English and American Literature 1700 to the Present*, ed. O.M. Brack Jr. and Warner Barnes (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969), pp.59-72.

[12] Ibid., p.61.

[13] Ibid., p.62.

[14] Park Honan, "Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century English Punctuation Theory," English Studies, No. 1 (1960), pp.92-102, points out that punctuation was indeed very erratic throughout the eighteenth century. "Punctuation flourishes exactly when we are willing to concede it a logical ground and a standard practice. Genung (1900) and later writers heed this, exploring what Genung calls that 'skilful employment of punctuation as a flexible, living, artistic thing which makes it so truly a cardinal factor in the organism of the sentence.' No such dynamic view of the stops is evident in the hundred-and-fifty year period after 1700. Struggling under twin concepts that made rational rule impossible, pointing appears to attract little interest and even less skill beyond limited circles of theoreticians and printers. Only when punctuation theory becomes relatively stabilized - after the decade of the eighteen-forties - do the common marks assume more than a common value" (p.102).

It was the most natural thing in the world, then, for eighteenth-century editors of Shakespeare to feel free to alter his punctuation.

[15] Nicholas Rowe, The Works of Mr. William Shakespeare (1709; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1967), I, sig. A2^{v}.

[16] A.W. Pollard, Shakespeare Folios and Quartos (London: Methuen, 1909).

[17] Edmond Malone, The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare (1790; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968), I, 10.

[18] Sidney Lee, Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies: Facsimile of the First Folio Edition, 1623. With introduction by Sidney Lee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), pp.xii-xiii. Quoted in W.W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp.86-87.

[19] Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, pp.87-88.

[20] I am indebted here to Greg's discussion of Pollard's theories on good and bad quartos. See: W.W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: A Survey of the Foundations of the Text (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942).

[21] Pollard, Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, pp.64-65.

[22] Greg, Editorial Problem, p. 11, points out that Pollard actually understated his case here, "for he assumed with earlier critics that the folio editors ... neglected the quartos of 2 Henry IV, Troilus and Cressida and Othello, whereas in fact it seems possible that they used two out of the three."

[23] Greg, Editorial Problem, pp.11-12

[24] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[25] For an excellent summary of the advances made in this field in the twentieth century, see: F.P. Wilson, Shakespeare and the New Bibliography, rev. and ed. by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

[26] A.W. Pollard, The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1923), pp. 5-6.

[27] Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, pp. 94-95.

[28] Ibid., p. 95.

[29] One example of such praise is the remark made by R.C. Bald, "Evidence and Inference in Bibliography," in English Institute Annual 1941 (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1942): "A brilliant and illuminating hypothesis, and the more likely to win acceptance from its simplicity.... It is a paper which can legitimately be compared to the one in which Darwin first formulated the theory of evolution...." Quoted in E.A.J. Honigmann, The Stability of Shakespeare's Text (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965), p.8.

[30] R.B. McKerrow, "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts," The Library, 12 (1931), 254.

[31] Ibid., 266.

[32] Quoted in Honigmann, The Stability of Shakespeare's Text, p.8.

[33] Fredson Bowers, On Editing Shakespeare (Charlotteville; University Press of Virginia, 1966).

[34] In fact, Bowers lists no less than thirteen different possibilities here. (On Editing Shakespeare, p. 18.)

[35] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[36] Honigmann, The Stability of Shakespeare's Text, pp. 8-9.

[37] Bowers, On Editing Shakespeare, p. 18.

[38] Ibid., p. 19.

[39] Ibid., pp. 19-20.

[40] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[41] Percy Simpson, Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeeth and Eighteenth Centuries (1935; rpt. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970).

[42] Simpson points out that "Ben Jonson was an assiduous proof-reader of his printed work, and he had no mercy on a bad compositor" (p. 11).

[43] This herculean task was accomplished with the aid of the Hinman Collating Machine, a machine developed by Hinman in 1952 which, by superimposing the image of one page upon the image of the corresponding page of another copy, makes differences readily apparent.

[44] Charlton Hinman, The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), I, 333.

[45] Alice Walker, Textual Problems of the First Folio (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1953), p. 7.

[46] Hinman shows that Compositor E was responsible for a fairly large amount of work on the tragedies, and since his work was carefully proof-read, this would account for the extraordinary large number of press-variants in the tragedies. (See Printing and Proof-Reading, I, 325-330.)

[47] See also : Charlton Hinman, "Cast-off Copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare," Shakespeare Quarterly, 6 (1955), 257-73.

[48] Samuel Johnson, The Plays of William Shakespeare (London: J. & R. Tonson, 1765), I, sig. C8^v - D1^r.

[49] W.W. Greg, "Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare," Proceedings of the British Academy, 14 (1928), 6.

[50] Wilson, p. 118.

[51] Johnson, sig. D8^v - E1^r.

[52] W.W. Greg, "Massinger's Autograph Corrections in The Duke of Milan, 1623," The Library, 4 (1924), 217.

[53] Wilson, p. 121.

Chapter II

[1] John Dryden, An Essay on Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Writings, ed. John L. Mahoney (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1965), p. 48.

[2] Ibid.

[3] W.P. Ker, ed., Essays of John Dryden (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961), I, 202.

[4] Ibid., 203.

[5] James R. Sutherland, "Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century," MLR, 28 (1933), 24.

[6] The subject, of course, has been discussed by many critics. The two works which I found most comprehensive and helpful are: George C. Branum, Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearean Tragedy (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1956). and Hazelton Spencer, Shakespeare Improved: The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927).

[7] Branum, pp. 69-70.

[8] Ibid., p. 75.

[9] Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, The Spectator, ed. Henry Morley (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1902), p. 99.

[10] Ibid., p. 100.

[11] Johnson, sig. B3^{r}.

[12] Branum, p. 91.

[13] Ibid., p. 92.

[14] Alexander Pope, "An Essay on Criticism," l. 155. Lines 140-168 are concerned with the notion of genius beyond the reach of art.

[15] Addison and Steele, p. 234.

[16] Emerson R. Marks, *The Poetics of Reason: English Neo-classical Criticism* (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 151.

[17] Sutherland, "Shakespeare's Imitators," p. 25.

[18] Thomas Warton, *History of English Poetry*, II (1778), 462-63. Quoted in Arthur Johnston, "Poetry and Criticism After 1740," in *Sphere History of Literature in the English Language: Vol. 4, Dryden to Johnson*, ed. Roger Lonsdale (London, Sphere Books Ltd., 1971), p. 371.

[19] Quoted in Marks, p. 159.

[20] Ibid., p. 158.

[21] Ibid., p. 156.

[22] McKerrow, *Treatment of Shakespeare's Text*, p. 5.

[23] Allardyce Nicoll, "The Editors of Shakespeare from first Folio to Malone," in *Studies in the First Folio: Written for the Shakespeare Association in Celebration of the First Folio Tercentenary* (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1924), p. 172.

[24] George Paston, *Mr. Pope: His Life and Times* (London: Hutchinson and Company, 1909), I, 264-65.

[25] McKerrow, *Treatment of Shakespeare's Text*, p. 5.

[26] In the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 57 (1787), 76, one finds the following table of prices that were paid by the London booksellers to the various editors of Shakespeare. The table is preceded by this comment: "[The amounts] prove that the poet has *enriched those* who have *impoverished him*."

	£	s	d
Mr. Rowe was paid	36	10	0
Mr. Hughes	28	7	0
Mr. Pope	217	12	0
Mr. Fenton	30	14	0
Mr. Gay	35	17	6
Mr. Whalley	12	0	0
Mr. Theobald	652	10	0
Dr. Warburton	500	0	0
Mr. Capel	300	0	0
Dr. Johnson for 1st edition	375	0	0
for 2nd edition	100	0	0
Total	2,288	10	6

Besides very considerable sum to critics without criticism, and commentators without a name.

[27] Jonathan Swift, for example, wrote after seeing Jane Shore: "I have seen a play professedly writ in the style of Shakespeare, wherein the resemblance lay in one single line, 'And so good morrow t'ye, good master lieutenant.'" (From: "The Last Volume," Mottes Miscellanies (1727), p. 41). Ironically, Swift not only misquotes the line, but also places it in the wrong play. It is from Lady Jane Grey.

In the twentieth century, Sophia Chantal Hart has said: "The reader of Jane Shore wonders how an editor of Shakespeare could fancy this play bore any resemblance to the work of the great dramatist. Evidently in the eighteenth century there was no very clear conception even by those who valued him most, of what Shakespeare stood for." (Hart, ed., The Fair Penitent and Jane Shore (Boston, 1907). Both of these examples are quoted in Harry William Pedicord, ed., Nicholas Rowe: The Tragedy of Jane Shore (London: Edward Arnold, 1975), pp. xxi-xxiii.

[28] J.M. Osborn, ed., Anecdotes, Observations, and Characters of Books and Men (Oxford, 1966), I, 183. Quoted in Pedicord, ed., Jane Shore, p. xxii.

[29] Pedicord, p. 9.

[30] J.R. Sutherland, ed., Three Plays by Nicholas Rowe (London: The Scholartis Press, 1929), pp. 33-34.

[31] Rowe, sig. A-A^{v}.

[32] Samuel Johnson, Lives of the English Poets, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), II, 71.

[33] Thomas R. Lounsbury, The Text of Shakespeare (1906; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970), p. 74.

[34] D. Nichol Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), p. 32. Quoted in Greg, Editorial Problem, pp. 4-5.

[35] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, pp. 30-51.

[36] Greg, Editorial Problem, p. 5.

[37] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 7.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ernest Walder, Shaksperian Criticism: Textual and Literary, From Dryden to the End of the Eighteenth Century (1895; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1972), p. 89.

[41] Alfred Jackson, "Rowe's Edition of Shakespeare," The Library, 10 (1930), 467.

[42] Ibid., 467-68.

[43] Walder, pp. 88-89. "Some of the misprints are obvious at first sight, thus in Merchant of Venice, i, 1, 27 Folios, Quartos have "And see my wealthy Andrew docks in sand." Rowe changed "docks" to "dock'd," which has been adopted after him.

In other cases the context helped him to his correction, thus in A.Y.L., ii, 3, 71, Adam says-

From seventeen years till now, almost fourscore,
Here lived I, but now live here no more.
At seventeen years many there fortunes seek,
But at fourscore it is too late a week.

In the first line Folio had "seaventie," but the "seventeen" in the third line shows this to be a misprint.

In the well-known lines in Macbeth, i, 7, 47,

I dare do all that may become a man;
Who dares do more is none.

We owe the sense to Rowe, who substituted "do" for the "no" of Folios.

Metrical considerations have sometimes supplied him with an emendation. In A.Y.L., iii,2,113, Rowe has restored the line 'Why should this a desert be?' where Folios omit 'a.'

[44] Jackson, 467.

[45] Ibid., 466. See also Walker, 90-91.

[46] See esp. McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, pp. 9-12, and Edward Wagenknecht, "The First Editor of Shakespeare," Colophon, 2, No. 8 (1931).

[47] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 9.

[48] Wagenknecht, 12.

[49] See Ibid., 5-6.

[50] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 12.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Wagenknecht, 6-9.

[54] McKerrow points out that "when Rowe began his work ... he left the Comedies as he found them, with the exception of the Merchant of Venice which he divided into scenes partially corresponding to those of an adaptation of the play by George Granville published in 1701 as The Jew of Venice. In the Histories he merely readjusted the act division in the first part of Henry VI and divided the third part, previously undivided, into acts, splitting one act into scenes. When, however, he came to Troilus and Cressida, the first of the Tragedies, he began to take the matter more seriously. (Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 11.)

[55] Ibid., p. 13. According to the table in the Gentleman's Magazine (see note 26), Hughes received £28 7s 0d for his work on this edition.

[56] Alexander Pope, The Works of Mr. William Shakespear (1723); rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1969), I, xxii-xxiii.

[57] Alexander Pope, "An Epistle from Mr. Pope, to Dr. Arbuthnot," pp. 159-160.

[58] James R. Sutherland, "The Dull Duty of an Editor," RES, 21 (1945), rpt. in Essential Articles for the Study of Alexander Pope, ed. Maynard Mack (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1968), p. 690.

[59] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, pp. 16-17.

[60] Ibid., p. 14.

[61] Hugh G. Dick, "Introduction" to Theobald's Preface to the Works of Shakespeare, Augustan Reprint Society, Extra series #2, Pub. #20 (Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1949), p. 1.

[62] Lewis Theobald, The Works of Shakespeare (1734; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968), I, xi.

[63] Sutherland, "Dull Duty of an Editor," pp. 675-76.

[64] Ibid., p. 675.

[65] J.C. Collins, "The Porson of Shakespearian Criticism," The Quarterly Review, 175 (1892), 109.

[66] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 21.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Richard Foster Jones, *Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship with Some Unpublished Letters* (1919; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1966), pp. 66-67.

[69] Jones, p. 67.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid., p. 64.

[72] McKerrow, *Treatment of Shakespeare's Text*, p. 22.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Lounsbury, p. 527.

[75] Lounsbury (pp. 527-28) offers the following table showing how Pope altered the text of *Measure for Measure* and to what extent Theobald was content to follow Pope's alterations:

Number of words added by Pope to the text ... 17
Number of these adopted by Theobald ... 15

Number of words omitted by Pope from the text ... 50
Number of these omissions adopted by Theobald ... 21

Number of words transposed by Pope ... 6
Number of these alterations adopted by Theobald ... 4

Number of words or syllables contracted or expanded by Pope ... 17
Number of these alterations adopted by Theobald ... 16

Number of substitutions made by Pope ... 57
Number of these adopted by Theobald ... 38

[76] McKerrow, *Treatment of Shakespeare's Text*, p. 23.

[77] Martin Beller, "Shakespeare's Editors, 1709-1857," Diss. Ohio State 1973, p. 10.

[78] See Jones, pp. 187-89 for a full discussion of Theobald's discoveries in this regard.

[79] Jones, pp. 184-85.

[80] Ibid., p. 182.

[81] McKerrow, *Treatment of Shakespeare's Text*, p. 24.

[82] Thomas Hanmer, *The Works of Shakespear* (1744; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1969), I, i-ii.

[83] *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, 7, No. 83 (1934), 474.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Hanmer, ii-iii.

[86] Ibid., iii, iv.

[87] Johnson, sig. D2^{v}.

[88] It is interesting to note, however, that Warburton's true character becomes apparent when the whole of his relationship with Pope is known. Warburton was, early in his career, a violent enemy of Pope's (see Lounsbury, pp. 351-62). Luckily, however, Pope never learned of Warburton's early animosity, and Warburton, no doubt, spared no efforts to keep it a secret.

[89] William Warburton, *The Works of Shakespear* (1747; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968), I, xiii.

[90] Beller, p. 72.

[91] Smith, *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 44.

[92] Johnson, sig. D3^{r}. A very interesting article on Johnson's reactions to some of Warburton's stranger notes and emendations is A.T. Hazen, "Johnson's Shakespeare: A Study in Cancellation," *TLS*, 24 Dec. 1938, p. 820. In this article Hazen quotes the sixteen cancels that Johnson made to his own edition, and which were preserved by Bishop Percy in his copy of Johnson's *Shakespeare*. The cancels support the view that after the completion of his edition Johnson decided to soften his criticism of Warburton. The type of criticism that Johnson made of Warburton's notes and emendations can be seen in the following few examples:

Volume I, X6 VERSO. (*Measure for Measure*, III,i, line 37). Warburton asks, "How does beauty make riches pleasant?" He therefore emends "Beauty" to "bounty." Johnson's comment reads as follows: "I am inclined to believe t(hat) neither man nor woman will ha(ve) much difficulty to tell this commentator how beauty makes ri(ches) pleasant.

Surely this emenda(tion) is not such as that an opportunity of inserting it should be purchased by declaring ignorance of what everyone knows...." In revising, Johnson omitted the damning phrase "this commentator," and in the second sentence he also made amends by inserting after "emendation" a qualifying phrase, "though it is elegant and ingenious."

Volume III, C5 VERSO. (Taming of the Shrew, I, ii,line 73). Here Warburton suggests a radical emendation for "Affection's edge in me." Johnson's comment is brief, "Surely the sense of the present reading is too obvious to be missed or mistaken without design." In revising he omitted the last two words.

Volume III, Q6 (Hamlet, III, iii, line 66). Warburton is puzzled by the King's struggle towards repentance. Johnson comments, "Here is again a difficulty which perhaps never puzzled any head but that of a critick." In the cancel this outburst is omitted, and an apologetic "I think" is inserted in the following sentence.

[93] Samuel Johnson, Proposals (1756) for Printing by Subscription The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare Corrected and Illustrated By Samuel Johnson in W.K. Wimsatt, Jr., ed., Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), pp. 16-17.

[94] Robert E. Scholes, "Dr. Johnson and the Bibliographical Criticism of Shakespeare," Shakespeare Quarterly, 11, no. 2 (1960), 166, has the following footnote concerning Johnson's statement in the Proposals: "Bibliographical critics from Edmond Malone (The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, in Ten Volumes, London, 1790, I, Pt. 1, p. ii) to W.W. Greg (The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, Oxford, 1951, p. 18) have quoted this sentence from the Proposals and then proceeded to undermine it. Greg quotes Pollard as describing this statement as 'the nearest approach to nonsense which the great Doctor ever made,' and goes on to suggest that Johnson's words 'no doubt helped to colour and distort the outlook of subsequent editors and critics.' What actually seems more likely is that subsequent editors and critics learned from Johnson's notes and Preface, and turned this knowledge against the Proposals - with the natural results."

[95] Ibid.

[96] Johnson, sig. C7^{v}.

[97] Scholes, 170

[98] Johnson, sig. D8^{v} - E1^{r}.

[99] Ibid., sig. D1^{v}.

[100] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 26.

[101] Scholes, 166-71.

[102] Ibid., 167-68.

[103] Ibid., 169.

[104] Arthur M. Eastman, "The Texts from which Johnson Printed His Shakespeare," JEGP, 49 (1950), 186, includes the following table in which he assigns Johnson's use of his two precedessors, volume by volume:

I	II	III	IV
Temp T	AYLI T	Shrew T	R2 -
MND T	LLL -	CofE T	1H4 -
TGofV T	WT T	MAdo -	2H4 -
MforM -	TN -	AWTEW T	H5 T
MofV -	MWofW T	KJohn -	1H6 T
V	VI	VII	VIII
2H6 T	Lear -	JC T	R&J T
3H6 T	Timon T	A&C T	Ham T
R3 -	Titus T	Cymb T	Oth. T
H8 T	Macb W	T&C T	
	Cor W		

The unassigned plays show peculiarities of both Theobald's and Warburton's editions.

[105] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 26, says that Johnson had access to about 17 early quartos, but only two of these belonged to first editions.

[106] Arthur M. Eastman, "Johnson's Shakespeare and the Laity, a Textual Study," PMLA, 65 (1950), 1112-21.

[107] Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, pp. 48-49.

[108] Alice Walker, "Edward Capell and his Edition of Shakespeare," Proceedings of the British Academy, 46 (1960), 132.

[109] Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, p. 55.

[110] Walder, p. 130.

[111] Ibid.

[112] George Steevens, Advertisement to the Reader (1773 Shakespeare) in Edmond Malone, The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare (1821; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1966), I, 173.

[113] Ibid., 175

[114] Walder, p. 130.

[115] George Steevens, Advertisement (1793 Shakespeare) in Malone, Shakspeare (1821), I, 264.

[116] Walder, p. 131.

[117] John Monck Mason, Preface to Comments on the Last Edition of Shakespear's Plays (1785) in Malone, Shakspeare (1821), I, 190.

[118] This new sophistication, of course, was not restricted to purely textual matters. As Martin Beller points out: "The years 1765-1795 were a period of almost unparalleled productivity in Shakespearean scholarship: witness Heath's Revisal (1765); Farmer's Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare (1767); Morgann's Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff (1777); Ritson's Remarks (1783); Richardson's and Whately's books on Shakespeare's characters (1784 & 1785 respectively) and, to culminate a great age of criticism instituted by Johnson, Whiter's Specimen of a Commentary (1799)." (p. 143)

[119] Malone, Shakspeare (1821), I, x.

[120] Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, p. 56.

[121] J.K. Walton, "Edmond Malone: an Irish Shakespeare scholar," Hermathena, 99 (1964), 13, claims that Malone excelled all other Shakespearean scholars in two ways: his well-developed historical sense, and his ability to assess the importance of theories and evidence.

[122] Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, p. 56.

[123] Edmond Malone, The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare (1790; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968), I, x.

[124] Ibid., xi.

[125] Ibid.

[126] Ibid., xii.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid., xii-xiii.

[129] Ibid., xiii.

[130] Ibid.

[131] Ibid.,xviii.

[132] Ibid., lvi. Malone here is quoting from Newton's Preface to his edition of Milton.

Chapter III

[1] Pope, Works of William Shakespear, I, vi.

[2] Perhaps the two most notable examples of modern critics treating Pope's editorial labours fairly are: Sutherland, "Dull Duty of an Editor," and John A. Hart, "Pope as Scholar-Editor," Studies in Bibliography, 23 (1970), 45-59.

[3] See chapter II, p. 57.

[4] Pope, The Iliad of Homer, Translated by Mr. Pope ... 1715 (fol.), I, 3. Quoted in Sutherland, "Dull Duty of an Editor," pp. 676-77.

[5] Sutherland, "Dull Duty of an Editor," p. 677.

[6] See chapter II, 56-57.

[7] Sutherland, "Dull Duty of an Editor," p. 683.

[8] Lounsbury, pp. 82-83.

[9] George Sherburn, The Early Career of Alexander Pope (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), p. 218.

[10] Whitwell Elwin and William John Courthope, The Works of Alexander Pope (London: John Murray, 1886), VI, 281. Quoted in Sherburn, p. 218.

[11] Sherburn, p. 219.

[12] Smith, *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 34.

[13] Elwin & Courthope, VIII, 46. Quoted in Sherburn, p. 232.

[14] Sherburn, p. 233.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Lounsbury, p. 79.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Pope, "Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot," ll. 231-48.

[19] Geoffrey Tillotson, *Pope and Human Nature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), p. 96. Tillotson goes on to quote the following assessment of Pope's financial achievement by Prof. R.H. Griffith:

> "Pope was the first man in English Literature to accumulate an independent fortune from the sale of books that were written as works of art. As well as poet, he was a man of business. He meant to see that his published books 'succeeded.' Taking environment by the throat, he compelled it to serve his own ends: he ameliorated risk into a reasonable certainty. In his youth, he meditated upon patronage, and dismissed it as a system for his own aggrandizement. It was an obsolescent system. As other customs inherited from the feudal organization of society decayed after the Rebellion, so patronage disintegrated through stages of a sort of stock-company patronage, which was published by subscription, and political-party patronage, which was the shifting of the burden of support in the reign of good Queen Anne from individual shoulders to the shoulders of the government. In his manhood, Pope watched the disintegration through. On the other hand, with education spreading out and downwards, the writing class had developed proportionally more rapidly than the class of reading purchasers of books. Hardship, poverty, a fierce struggle to survive had ensued among writers, often a losing struggle. Prose and verse from 1670 to 1740 are replete with whimpers, moans, sardonic laughter, anathemas upon the Muses' arid breasts. A dependable patron was gone, a sustaining public was not yet come. With such a recalcitrant condition Pope wrestled; from it he wrested success. He resorted at times to subterfuges we think undignified, but he lost no contemporary prestige by them; we pronounce them base, he thought them fire with which to whip the devil. And, as we have seen, he knew his devils pretty intimately. The subterfuges of the Letters were the worst. Yet see what he did with them. The letters as part of the *Works* of Wycherley fell utterly flat in 1729, in spite of two famous names associated with them. He took the very same letters, the sheets indeed of the identical book that had failed, and, by manipulation and managed publicity, forced them in 1735 to become the literary sensation of the decade.

If Pope is not the greatest among English poets, he is the greatest advertiser and publisher among them. The conclusion of the whole matter is, that by right ways and by wrong ways Pope was a very powerful influence in developing by the beginning of the second half of the eighteenth century that "reading public" in which, ever since, men of letters have moved and had their being, and by which they have lived."

[20] Lounsbury, p. 79.

[21] Ibid., p. 80.

[22] Sherburn, pp. 311-12. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

> I assure y^u I have considerd & reconsider'd this matter, & would give y^u all y^e Proofs possible that I w^d please you, w^{ch} are consistent with my reason & honour. I am absolutely obliged to mention y^e business of Shakespear, (it is Requird directly of me, besides, by those whom I cannot disobey). But you see I comply to y^e utmost w^{th} you, in leaving out all your Three objections. The saying before y^t I c^d not deny it at your Request was meant meerly to express our Friendship, w^{ch} y^u seemd, as well as myself, to desire. Tho indeed y^e putting you down as a Receiver of y^e Subscriptions for me, was enough to demonstrate upon what good terms we stood. You'l see, by this wondrous $lett^r$ enclosed, how highly Lintot takes it, in that very light. I sh^d be glad y^u c^d call at Ld Peterborrows as soon as y^u go out this morning. As to y^e other particular I thank y^u for your advice, w^{ch} I'm sure is well meant, & I believe partly Right, but I don't think it so honourable a part to conceal y^e least branch of a Truth till and Interest is servd: 'Tis fairer to do it at first, & that's all my reason. You may depend on my taking every thing right of you, & upon my being sincerely (without any views, for you'l find I have none)
> Y^r affect. humble $Serv^t$. / A. Pope.

[23] See chapter II, p. 59.

[24] Hart, p. 49.

[25] Sherburn, p. 232.

[26] Ibid., p. 235.

[27] Donald B. Clark, Alexander Pope (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1967), p. 71.

[28] Sherburn, p. 235.

[29] John Butt, Pope's Taste in Shakespeare (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936), p. 4.

[30] Sherburn, p. 234.

[31] Ibid.

[32] See Ibid., p. 240.

[33] Ibid., p. 240-41.

[34] See Ibid., pp. 241-44.

[35] Lounsbury, p. 111.

[36] See chapter II, pp. 63-65.

[37] W.L. MacDonald, Pope and his Critics: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Personalities (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1951), pp. 114-15.

[38] Ibid., p. 116.

[39] See chapter II, pp. 63-66.

[40] See esp. Lounsbury, and also Jones, Lewis Theobald.

[41] MacDonald, p. 118.

[42] Smith, Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century, p. 66.

[43] Ibid., p. 63.

[44] Malcolm Goldstein, Pope and the Augustan Stage (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 109-10.

[45] Pope. Works of William Shakespear, I,i.

[46] Ibid., ii.

[47] Ibid., iii.

[48] Ibid., iv.

[49] Ibid., v.

[50] Ibid., xvi.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid., xvii.

[53] Ibid.

[54] H.W. Crundell, "Actors' Parts and Elizabethan Play-Texts," N&Q, 180 (1941), 351.

[55] Pope, Works of William Shakespear, I, xix.

[56] See chapter II, pp. 36-37.

[57] Pope, Works of William Shakespear, I, xxiii.

[58] See Butt, and also P. Dixon, "Pope's Shakespeare," JEGP, 63 (1964), 191-203.

[59] Pope, Works of William Shakespear, I, xxiii.

[60] Hans Schmidt, Die Shakespeare Ausgabe von Pope, Diss. Giessen (Darmstadt, 1912).

[61] See chapter II, pp. 44-45.

[62] Lounsbury, p. 87. Quoted in Hart, p. 46.

[63] Hart, p. 46.

[64] Ibid., pp. 87-88.

[65] Ibid., pp. 89-90.

[66] Ibid., p. 48.

[67] Act and scene divisions follow that of Horace Howard Furness, ed., The Tempest: New Variorum Edition (1892; rpt. New York: American Scholar, 1966). Subsequent references to The Tempest are from this edition.

[68] Lounsbury, p. 108.

[69] Ibid., p. 110

[70] Frank Kermode, ed., *The Tempest: New Arden Edition* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1966), p. 36.

[71] Ibid., p. 60.

[72] Furness, ed., *The Tempest*, p. 125.

[73] Ibid., p. 144.

[74] It is interesting to note that Frank Kermode, editor of the *Arden Tempest*, devotes almost three full pages to a bibliographical discussion of this passage. The following paragraph will give the reader some idea of the tenour of his discussion.

> "Now, we must emend; and a proposal which is open to none of the objections stated above is that Shakespeare wrote *busielest* and the compositor, or a copyist, split this into *busie lest*. This reading has the advantage that, as Dr. Harold Brooks remarks, it would have been a hard one for anyone dealing with the copy, from the first transcriber up to the proofreader. It is certainly a curious formation -a superlative form of the adverb "busily" - but it is paralleled by the *easilest* of *Cymb*., IV.ii.207. Bulloch conjectured "busiliest," and this needs only slight alteration to meet bibliographical objections and conform more closely to the example from *Cymbeline*. In one respect, it must be confessed, *busilest* is less satisfactory than "busiest": "my thoughts are than busiest" serves better than "my thoughts then most busily refresh me," because they obviously would refresh his labours most when he was labouring, not when he wasn't. But the adverb-adjective confusion is no great matter in this play; perhaps Shakespeare "should" have written "busiest," but what he probably did write was *busielest*" (p.72).

[75] Hart, through a study of Pope's editorial labours on *Macbeth* and *Antony & Cleopatra*, comes to a similar conclusion. He says about *Macbeth*:

> "... Pope's references to the folio were not made merely because he was "puzzled" for a meaning but because he had collated with a certain amount of fidelity. This is a disappointing conclusion, but nonetheless a valid and effective one"(p.57).

He concludes his discussion of Pope's use of the folio texts by saying that "It seems safe to conclude ... that Pope paid the folio text as much attention as he did to any of the quarto editions he collated" (p.58).

[76] Schmidt, p. 33. Quoted in Hart, pp. 48-49.

[77] Hart, p. 49.

[78] Ibid., p. 55. Hart also adds in a footnoe that "The statistics of Pope's use of the Hamlet quartos are: Act I, 50 adaptations; Act II, 55; Act III, 54; Act IV, 55; Act V, 70."

[79] All references to Othello are from Horace Howard Furness, ed., Othello: New Variorum Edition (1886; rpt. New York: American Scholar, 1965).

[80] See Appendix A, pp. 240-44, for an analysis of Pope's original emendations in Othello.

[81] Furness, ed., Othello, p. 199.

[82] See M.R. Ridley, ed., Othello: New Arden Edition (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1967), pp. xvi-xliii.

[83] Ibid., p. xliii.

[84] Furness, ed., Othello, p. 55

[85] Ridley's discussion of this line provides an interesting contrast to Pope's method. "This line is an interesting example of editorial operations, since the acceptance of F's portance is almost as unanimous as the rejection of F's Travellours. But if one, why not the other? Judged by 'preferability' - that dangerous criterion - portance is no doubt a good mouth-filling phrase, by the side of which with it all seems anaemic. But is it not also seriously out of character? Othello is the last man to expatiate on his own creditable behaviour under stress, and portance has inescapably the connotation of "how a man carries himself" and not merely "what happens to him". Further, with it all marks a transition: so far Othello had related his adventures in war; then, along with those, he went on to relate the scenes and people he had met with on his travels" (Othello, p. 29).

[86] Pope, Works of William Shakespear, VI, 491.

[87] Furness's comment on the word "Kisses" provides an interesting counterpoint to Pope: "And yet we must remember that kissing in Elizabeth's time was not as significant as it is now. See the openness with which, in II, i, Cassio kisses Emelia" (Othello, p. 59).

[88] Pope, Works of William Shakespear, I, xvi.

[89] Ibid., VI, 259.

[90] Ibid., VI, 305.

[91] All references to Romeo and Juliet are from Horace Howard Furness, ed., Romeo and Juliet: New Variorum Edition (1871; rpt. New York: American Scholar, 1963).

[92] Pope, Works of William Shakespear, VI, 308.

[93] Lounsbury, p. 103. Lounsbury is especially offended at Pope's rationale for omitting nineteen lines of a speech by Friar Laurence to Romeo in Act 3, scene 3. Pope says, "Here follows in the common books a great deal of nonsense, not one word of which is to be found in the first edition" (Pope, Works of William Shakespear, VI, 304).

[94] See Appendix A, pp. 244-47, for an analysis of Pope's use of Q1. There are 83 occasions where Pope might have used a quarto other than Q1. Of these, 20 readings definitely come from Q5 (1637) - i.e. they differ from readings in Q1 or Q2 (1599).

Chapter IV

[1] Richard Farmer, "An Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare," in Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare, ed. David Nichol Smith (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1903), p. 197.

[2] The two most important recent studies of Capell's Shakespearean labours are: Alice Walker, "Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," and Sailendra K. Sen, Capell and Malone, and Modern Critical Bibliography (1964; rpt. Folcroft, Pa.: The Folcroft Press, 1969).

[3] Edward Capell, Mr. William Shakespeare: His Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies (1767-68; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968), I, 29-30.

[4] Walker, "Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 132.

[5] Samuel Pegge, "Brief Memoirs of Edward Capell, Esq.," in Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century, I, ed. John Nichols (London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1817), 465.

[6] Ibid., 469.

[7] Ibid., 474.

[8] Ibid., 476.

[9] See Ibid., 474-75.

[10] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 19.

[11] Pegge, 468.

[12] Ibid., 470.

[13] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 19.

[14] Ibid., 20.

[15] See chapter I, pp. 5-6.

[16] Walker, "Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 137.

[17] Ibid., p. 138.

[18] Sen, pp. 22-23.

[19] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 9.

[20] Ibid., 10-11.

[21] Ibid., 11.

[22] See chapter I, pp. 14-18.

[23] See chapter I, pp. 19-21.

[24] See chapter I, pp. 15-17.

[25] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 5-6.

[26] Sen, pp. 29-30.

[27] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 4.

[28] Ibid., 6-7.

[29] Ibid., 13.

[30] See chapter I, pp. 6-11 and pp. 23-26.

[31] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 21-22.

[32] McKerrow, Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, p. 28.

[33] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 22.

[34] It is interesting to note that Capell developed and made use of these editorial principles some time before his edition of Shakespeare was published. R.G. Moyles, "Edward Capell (1713-1781) As Editor of Paradise Lost," Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, 6 (1975), 252-261, conclusively shows that Capell used similar methods in his edition of Paradise Lost. Moyles concludes his discussion with the following assessment of Capell's performance: "He was, I think I have shown, in terms of his treatment of the substantive text, his awareness of the authoritative editions, and his inclusion of a textual apparatus, more than a hundred years ahead of his time. One would not hesitate in also calling him the first systematic editor of Paradise Lost" (pp. 259-60).

Also, one can see from the following extract from the preface to his Prolusions; or, Select Pieces of Antient Poetry (1760), that his editorial principles were firmly established long before his edition of Shakespeare was published:

"From what editions the several pieces were taken, is very faithfully related at the end of each piece; and the editor thinks he may with confidence affirm, that they are the first, and best, and only ones worth consulting. When a poem was to be proceeded upon, the editions that belong to it were first collated; and with what care, let that minuteness speak which may be seen in the various readings: In the course of this collation it well appear'd, that some one edition was to be prefer'd to the others: that edition therefore was made the ground-work of what is now publish'd; and it is never departed from, but in places where some other edition had a reading most apparently better; or in some other places as were very plainly corrupt, but, assistance of books failing, were to be amended by conjecture; in the first of these cases, the reading that was judg'd best is inserted into the text of the poem, and the rejected reading may be found in it's place at the end; and, in the other, the conjectural reading is inserted likewise, and that upon which it is built at the bottom of the page: Where the corruption of a passage arose from omissions, - whereby the sense, the versification, or both were defective, - it is endeavour'd to be amended by the insertion of such word, or words, as seem'd most natural to the place; and all such words are printed in a black letter. Upon this plan, (the merit of which the publick is now to judge of) the text of one edition, the best that could be found, is made the establish'd text of that particular poem; and every departure from it, how minute soever, is at once offer'd to the eye in the most simple manner, without parade of notes which but divert the attention..." (Quoted by Sen, pp. 48-49).

[35] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 22.

[36] Ibid., 22-23.

[37] Walker points out that the Trinity College transcript of this volume occupied Capell between 3 February 1767 and 16 January, 1771 ("Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 145).

[38] Ibid., p. 144.

[39] Pegge, 472.

[40] Ibid., 473.

[41] Walker, "Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 145.

[42] See chapter I, p. 31.

[43] Walker, "Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 147.

[44] See chapter III, p. 123.

[45] Furness points out that in II.i.300, where the Folio text reads, "And looke how well my Garments fit upon me," Capell replaces "well" with "feat." Furness comments: "I can find no reference whatsoever to the change in his Notes, his Various Readings, or in his Errata. It has entirely escaped the notice of every editor, I believe, from that day to this" (Tempest, p. 120). Certainly this is one of the very few instances where Capell slipped up in this regard.

[46] Edward Capell, Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare, II, (1780; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970), 55-56.

[47] Perhaps surprizingly, Alice Walker claims that Capell has been somewhat unfairly criticized for his style, which she finds "informal," and "attractively free from bookishness" ("Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 146). I personally agree more with Samuel Johnson who, on one occasion, is reported to have said, "Had Capell come to me I would have endowed his purpose with words" (Quoted by Furness, Tempest, p. 27).

[48] Capell, Notes, II, 64.

[49] Capell, Shakespeare, I, 23-25.

[50] Alice Walker argues that Capell's obsession with an attractive looking text was one of the primary causes of the unpopularity of his edition:

"That his *Shakespeare* did not receive the attention it merited was due to his refusal to have his pages made unsightly by footnotes. Until his *Notes* appeared, the only critical apparatus he supplied (apart from his Introduction) was that, in the dialogue of his text, he printed in black letter any word or words that were not in the old editions and that he recorded, at the foot of the page, his copy-text reading if his emendation was taken from the moderns and if it could be accomodated in the one line he allowed himself for critical matter of this kind. Thus in *Hamlet*, 'bonds' appears in a footnote, since he accepted Theobald's emendation 'bawds', but he did not record Q2's 'friendly' (in the phrase 'like friendly Falconers') which he rejected for the Folio's 'French'. The latter kind of information was reserved for the Various Readings which were to follow with his *Notes*. There are sixty-five footnotes in his *Hamlet* of the 'bonds' type, all neatly compressed into a single line at the foot of the page, but they give, of course no inkling either of the number or complexity of the variants or of the difference between his text (based on Q2) and earlier ones (based mainly on the folio). Readers were thus deprived, until his *Notes* were published of what was most essential to the appreciation of his methods. His debts to the moderns were acknowledged [as footnote - Though not by name ... since even initials appeared to him to make the page unsightly], but he had yet to show how many authentic readings he had restored from the authoritative texts and on what principles his selection of readings was based" ("Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 143).

[51] Capell, *Notes*, II, 59.

[52] See chapter III, pp. 126-27.

[53] Capell, *Notes*, II, 65-66.

[54] Furness, ed., *Tempest*, pp. 145-46.

[55] See chapter III, footnote #74.

[56] Capell, *Notes*, II, 57.

[57] Ibid., 67-68.

[58] See chapter I, p. 31.

[59] Kermode, ed., *Tempest*, p. 93.

[60] Quoted by Furness, ed., Tempest, p. 188.

[61] Ibid., p. 189.

[62] See Appendix B, pp.248-251 for an analysis of Capell's original emendations and his use of emendations of other eighteenth-century editors in Othello.

[63] It is interesting to note that M.R. Ridley, editor of the New Arden Othello, also has difficulty with the lines. He accepts the Folio reading, but his uneasiness is apparent: "shut ... up) Neither this nor Q1's shoote is very easily interpretable; the passage can mean "confine myself to some other way of life that may lead to Fortune's benefits" but shut is an oddly strong word for that, and the passage which Steevens quotes to support it from Mac., II.i.16 seems irrelevant, since "shut up In measureless content" is a picture of enclosure in a state of mind, not in a course of action. I have taken F's reading only because it can be made to mean something, whereas Q1's, even with "on" for in, and in spite of Mason's defence, hardly can."

[64] Capell, Notes, II, 150-51.

[65] Ibid., 152.

[66] Edward Capell, Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare, I, (1779; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970), 54.

[67] Capell, Notes, II, 154.

[68] Ridley, ed., Othello, p. 170. It is also interesting to note that here, as in so many other places, Samuel Johnson and Capell arrive at similar readings. Johnson supports the Folio's "quat," defining it as "... a pimple, which by rubbing is made to smart, or is rubbed to sense." Johnson goes on to say that "Roderigo is called a "quat" by the same mode of speech as a low fellow is now termed in low language a scab. To rub to the sense is to rub to the quick" (Var. p. 283). One suspects that sources of reference had greatly improved since Pope's time.

[69] Capell, Notes, II, 154.

[70] Ibid., 142.

[71] Ibid., 154.

[72] Walker, "Capell's Edition of Shakespeare," p. 142.

[73] For an analysis of Capell's own handling of the text of Romeo and Juliet, see Appendix B, pp. 252-261.

[74] Capell, Notes, II, 2.

[75] Ibid., 10.

[76] Ibid., 3.

[77] Ibid., 5.

[78] Ibid., 15.

[79] It is interesting to note that the editorial philosophy behind John Dover Wilson's handling of these lines is not very different from Capell's. John Dover Wilson, ed., Romeo and Juliet (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1955), contains the following note to the lines: "J.D.W. conj. that ll. 42-4 were Sh.'s first shot, for which he later substituted ll. 33-9 ('But Romeo ... kisses sin'); writing these seven new lines in the margin or on a slip, and forgetting to delete the three old ones. The context gains if these three are left out , while nothing is lost but l. 44, which is distinctly weak" (pp. 187-88).

[80] Capell, Notes, II, 21.

Chapter V

[1] Malone, Shakespear (1790), I, lxix.

A Selected Bibliography

Aden, John M., ed. The Critical Opinions of John Dryden. Nashville: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1963.

Alexander, Peter. "Restoring Shakespeare: The Modern Editor's Task." Shakespeare Survey, 5 (1952), 1-9.

Anon. "Commonplace Notes." Gentleman's Magazine, 57 (1787), 76.

Atkins, J.W.H. English Literary Criticism: Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. London: Methuen, 1951.

Babcock, R.W. The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry 1766-1799: A Study in English Criticism of the Late Eighteenth Century. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.

Baender, Paul. "The Meaning of Copy Text." Studies in Bibliography, 22 (1969), 311-18.

Bald, R.C. "Editorial Problems - A Preliminary Survey." Art and Error: Modern Textual Editing. Ed. Ronald Gottesman and Scott Bennett. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1970, pp. 37-53.

Bate, Walter Jackson, ed. Criticism: The Major Texts. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1970.

Bate, Walter Jackson. From Classic to Romantic: Premises of Taste in Eighteenth-Century England. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1946.

Bateson, F.W. "Modern Bibliography and the Literary Artifact." English Studies Today. 2nd Series. Ed. G.A. Bonnard. Bern: Francke Verlag, 1961, pp. 67-77.

Beller, Martin. "Shakespeare's Editors: 1709-1857." Diss. Ohio State, 1973.

Bennet, Norman. "Warburton's Shakespear." N&Q, 3 (February 1893), 141-42.

Black, Mathew W. Shakespeare's Seventeenth-Century Editors: 1632-1685. 1937; rpt. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1966.

Bodleian Library Record, 2 (July, 1946), 127-28.

Bosker, A. Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson. New York: Hafner Pub. Co., 1954.

Bowers, Fredson. Bibliography and Textual Criticism. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Bowers, Fredson. "Current Theories of Copy-Text, with an Illustration from Dryden." Modern Philology, 68 (1950). Rpt. in Bibliography and Textual Criticism: English and American Literature 1700 to the Present. Ed. O.M. Brack Jr. and Warner Barnes. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969, pp. 59-72.

Bowers, Fredson. "Established Texts and Definitive Editions." Philological Quarterly, 41 (1962), 1-17.

Bowers, Fredson. "Greg's 'Rationale of Copy-Text' Revisited." Studies in Bibliography, 31 (1978), 90-161.

Bowers, Fredson. "An Examination of the Method of Proof-Correction in Lear." The Library, 2 (1947), 20-44.

Bowers, Fredson, On Editing Shakespeare. Charlotteville: Univ. Press of Virginia, 1966.

Bowers, Fredson. Principles of Bibliographical Description. 1949; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.

Bowers, Fredson. "Some Relations of Bibliography to Editorial Problems." Studies in Bibliography, 3 (1951), 37-62.

Bowers, Fredson. Textual and Literary Criticism. London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1966.

Bowers, Fredson. "Textual Criticism." The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in the Modern Languages and Literatures. Ed. James Thorpe. New York: Modern Language Association, 1970, pp. 29-54.

Branam, George C. Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearian Tragedy. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1956.

Bredvold, Louis I. The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden: Studies in Some Aspects of Seventeenth-Century Thought. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1956.

Bredvold, Louis I. The Natural History of Sensibility. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1962.

Butt, John, ed. The Poems of Alexander Pope. 1963; rpt. London: Methuen, 1965.

Butt, John. Pope's Taste in Shakespeare. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936.

Burd, Henry A. "Joseph Ritson and Some Eighteenth-Century Editors of Shakespeare." Shakespeare Studies by Members of the Department of English of the University of Wisconsin. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1961, pp. 253-275.

Cadwalader, John. "Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare Manuscript." MLN, 55 (1940), 108-09.

Capell, Edward. Mr. William Shakespeare: His Commedies, Histories, and Tragedies. 10 vols. 1767-68; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

Capell, Edward. Notes and Various Readings to Shakespeare. 3 vols. 1780; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.

Chambers, E.K. William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

Clark, Donald B. Alexander Pope. New York: Twayne, 1967.

Collins, J.C. "The Porson of Shakespearian Criticism." The Quarterly Review, 175 (1892), 102-31.

Colvile, K.N. "Shakespeare's First Critical Editor." The Nineteenth Century, 86 (1919), 266-79.

Corbin, John. "Shakespeare Against His Editors." The North American Review, 184 (1907), 396-406.

Craig, Hardin. A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1961.

Crundell, H.W. "Actors' Parts and Elizabethan Play-texts." N&Q, 180 (1941), 350-51.

Cuming, A. "A Copy of Shakespeare's works which formally belonged to Dr. Johnson." RES, 3 (April 1927), 208-12.

Daniel, P.A., ed. Romeo and Juliet: A Parallel Text Edition of the First Two Quartos. London: N. Trubner, 1874.

Dawson, G.E. "Warburton, Hanmer and the 1745 edition of Shakespeare." Studies in Bibliography, 2 (1949), 35-48.

Dixon, Peter. "Edward Bysshe and Pope's Shakespear." N&Q, 209 (1964), 292-93.

Dixon, Peter. "Pope's Shakespeare." JEGP, 63 (1964), 191-203.

Dryden, John. An Essay on Dramatic Poesy and Other Critical Writings. Ed. John L. Mahoney. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965.

Eastman, Arthur M. "In Defense of Dr. Johnson." Shakespeare Quarterly, 8, No. 4 (1957), 493-500.

Eastman, Arthur M. "Johnson's Shakespeare and the laity, a textual study." PMLA, 65 (Dec. 1950), 1112-21.

Eastman, Arthur M. "Johnson's Shakespearian Labours in 1765." *MLN*, 63 (1948), 512-15.

Eastman, Arthur M. "The Texts from which Johnson Printed his Shakespeare." *JEGP*, 59 (1950), 182-91.

Elwin, Whitwell and William John Courthope. *The Works of Alexander Pope*. 10 vols. London: John Murray, 1886.

Evans, G. Blakemore. "The text of Johnson's Shakespeare (1765)." *Philological Quarterly*, 28 (1949), 425-28.

Fraser, Russell A. "Pope and Shakespeare." *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 59 (1960), 88-102.

Frost, William, ed. *Selected Works of John Dryden*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Furness, Horace Howard, ed. *Othello: New Variorum Edition*. 1886; rpt. New York: American Scholar, 1965.

Furness, Horace Howard, ed., *Romeo and Juliet: New Variorum Edition*. 1871; rpt. New York: American Scholar, 1963.

Furness, Horace Howard, ed. *The Tempest: New Variorum Edition*. 1892; rpt. New York: American Scholar, 1966.

Furnivall, Frederick J. "Pope's Shakespeare Quarto." *N&Q*, 10 (August 1906), 107.

Goldgar, Bertrand A. ed. *Literary Criticism of Alexander Pope*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1965.

Goldstein, Malcolm, ed. *The Fair Pentitent* by Nicholas Rowe. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.

Goldstein, Malcolm. *Pope and the Augustan Stage*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958.

Goldstein, Malcolm. "Pope, Sheffield and Shakespeare's Julius Caesar." *MLN*, 71 (1956), 8-10.

Greg, W.W. *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: A Survey of the Foundations of the Text*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Greg, W.W. "McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' Reconsidered." *RES*, 17 (April 1941), 139-49.

Greg, W.W. "Massinger's Autograph Corrections in *The Duke of Milan*, 1623." *The Library*, 4 (1924), 217.

Greg, W.W. "On Certain False Dates in Shakespearean Quartos." The Library, 9 (1908), 113-31, 381-409.

Greg, W.W. "Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare." Proceedings of the British Academy, 14 (1928).

Greg, W.W. "The Rationale of Copy-Text." Studies in Bibliography, 3 (1950). Rpt. in Bibliography and Textual Criticism: English and American Literature 1700 to the Present. Ed. O.M. Brack Jr. and Warner Barnes. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969, pp. 41-58.

Greg W.W. The Shakespeare First Folio. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Hanmer, Thomas. The Works of Shakespeare. 6 vols. 1734; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

Hart, C.W. "Dr. Johnson's 1745 Shakespeare Proposals." MLN, 52 (1938), 367-68.

Hart, John A. "Pope as Scholar-Editor." Studies in Bibliography, 23 (1970), 45-59.

Hazen, Allen Tracy. "Johnson's Shakespeare, a study in cancellation." TLS, 28 Dec. 1938, p. 820.

Hinman, Charlton. "Cast-off Copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare," Shakespeare Quarterly, 6 (1955), 257-73.

Hinman, Charlton, ed. The First Folio of Shakespeare - The Norton Facsimile. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1968.

Hinman, Charlton. The Printing and Proof-reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Hinman, Charlton. "Shakespeare's Text - Then, Now and Tomorrow." Shakespeare Survey, 18 (1965), 25-35.

Hinman, Charlton & Fredson Bowers. Two Lectures on Editing: Shakespeare and Hawthorne. Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press, 1969.

Hogan, C.B. Shakespeare in the Theatre: 1701-1800. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

Honan, Park. "Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century English Punctuation Theory." English Studies, 1 (1960), 92-102.

Honigmann, E.A.J. The Stability of Shakespeare's Text. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1965.

Howard-Hill, T.H. "The Compositors of Shakespeare's Folio Comedies." Studies in Bibliography, 26 (1973), 61-106.

Jackson, Alfred. "Pope's Epitaphs on Nicholas Rowe." RES, 7 (1931), 76-79.

Jackson, Alfred. "Rowe's Edition of Shakespeare." The Library, 10 (1930), 455-73.

Johnson, Samuel. Lives of the English Poets. 3 vols. Ed. George Birkbeck Hill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Johnson, Samuel. The Plays of William Shakespeare. 8 vols. London: J.&R. Tonson, 1765.

Johnston, Arthur. "Poetry and Criticism after 1740." Sphere History of Literature in the English Language, Vol. 4: Dryden to Johnson. Ed. Roger Lonsdale. London: Sphere Books, Ltd., 1971, pp. 357-98.

Jones, Richard F. Lewis Theobald: his contribution to English Scholarship with some Unpublished Letters. 1919; rpt. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1966.

Ker, W.K., ed. Essays of John Dryden. 2 vols. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Kermode, Frank, ed. The Tempest: New Arden Edition. London: Methuen, 1966.

Lee, Sidney, ed. Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies: Facsimile of the First Folio Edition, 1623. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.

Lounsbury, Thomas R. The Text of Shakespeare: Its History from the publication of the Quartos and Folios Down to and Including the Publication of the Editions of Pope and Theobald. 1906; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

MacDonald, W.L. Pope and his Critics: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Personalities. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1951.

McKenzie, D.F. "Compositor B's Role in The Merchant of Venice, Q2 (1619)." Studies in Bibliography, 12 (1959), 75-90.

McKerrow, R.B. "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts." The Library, 12 (1931), 253-75.

McKerrow, R.B. Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

McKerrow, R.B. "Rowe's Shakespeare, 1709." TLS, 8 March, 1934, p. 168.

McKerrow, R.B. The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors, 1709-1768. London: H. Milford, 1933.

Madan, Falconer. "The First Oxford Shakespeare." Bodleian Quarterly Record, 7, No. 83 (1934), 474.

Malone, Edmond. The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare. 10 vols. 1790; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

Malone, Edmond. The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare. 21 vols. 1821; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Marder, Louis. His Exits and His Entrances: The Story of Shakespeare's Reputation. Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1963.

Marks, Emerson R. The Poetics of Reason: English Neoclassical Criticism. New York: Random House, 1968.

Miller, Aura. "The sources of the text of Hamlet in the editions of Rowe, Pope, and Theobald." MLN, 22 (July 1907), 163-68.

Monagham, T.J. "Johnson's Addition to his Shakespeare for the edition of 1773." RES, 4 (1953), 234-48.

Monk, S.H. The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in Eighteenth-Century England. New York: MLA, 1935.

Morley, Henry, ed. The Spectator, by Joseph Addison and Richard Steele. London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd. 1902.

Moyles, R.G. "Edward Capell (1713-1781) As Editor of Paradise Lost." Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, 6 (1975), 252-61.

Needham, H.A., ed. Taste and Criticism in the Eighteenth Century: A Selection of Texts Illustrating the Evolution of Taste and the Development of Critical Theory. London: Harrap, 1952.

Neidig, W.J. "The Shakespeare Quartos of 1619." Modern Philology, 8 (1910), 145-63.

Nicoll, Allardyce. Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1922.

Nicoll, Allardyce. "The Editors of Shakespeare from First Folio to Malone." Studies in the First Folio: Written for the Shakespeare Association in Celebration of the First Folio Tercentenary. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1924, pp. 157-178.

Othello: 1622. Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 16. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Paston, George. Mr. Pope: His Life and Times. 2 vols. London: Hutchinson and Co., 1909.

Pedicord, Harry William, ed. The Tragedy of Jane Shore by Nicholas Rowe. London: Edward Arnold, 1975.

Pegge, Samuel. "Brief Memoirs of Edward Capell, Esq." Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century. Ed. John Nichols. London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1817. I, 465-76.

Pollard, Alfred W. The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1923.

Pollard, Alfred W. Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1920.

Pollard, Alfred W. Shakespeare Folios and Quartos. London: Methuen, 1909.

Pollard, Alfred W. "Shakespeare's Text." A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Ed. H. Granville-Barker and G.B. Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1934, pp. 263-86.

Pope, Alexander. The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. 6 vols. 1723; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1969.

Quennell, Peter. Alexander Pope: The Education of Genius; 1688-1728. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968.

Raleigh, Sir W.A. "Johnson on Shakespeare." Six Essays on Johnson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927, pp. 75-97.

Ralli, Augustus. A History of Shakespearian Criticism, Vol. I. London: Oxford Univ. Press, Humphrey Milford, 1932.

Rhodes, R. Compton. Shakespeare's First Folio. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1923.

Ridley, M.R. ed., Othello: New Arden Edition. London: Methuen, 1967.

Robinson, H.S. English Shakespearean Criticism in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Gordian Press, 1968.

Rowe, Nicholas. Some Account of the Life of Mr. William Shakespear (1709). Intro. Samuel H. Monk. The Augustan Reprint Society, extra series #1, pub. #17. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1948.

Rowe, Nicholas. The Works of Mr. William Shakespeare. 7 vols. 1709; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1967.

Sayce, R.A. "Compositorial Practices and the Localisation of Printed Books, 1530-1800." The Library, 21 (1966), 1-45.

Scholes, Robert E. "Dr. Johnson and the Bibliographical Criticism of Shakespeare." Shakespeare Quarterly, 11, No. 2 (1960), 163-71.

Sen, Sailendra K. Capell and Malone, and Modern Critical Biography. 1964; rpt. Folcroft Pa.: Folcroft Press, 1969.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Dr. Johnson's Dictionary and Warburton's Shakespeare." Philological Quarterly, 33 (Jan. 1954), 94-96.

Sherbo, Arthur. Samuel Johnson, Editor of Shakespeare: with an Essay on The Adventurer. Urbana: The Univ. of Illinois Press, 1964.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Sanguine Expectations: Dr. Johnson's Shakespeare." Shakespeare Quarterly, 9, No. 3 (1958), 426-28.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Warburton and the 1745 Shakespeare." JEGP, 51 (1952), 71-82.

Sherburn, George. The Early Career of Alexander Pope. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.

Simpson, Percy. Proof Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeeth and Eighteenth Centuries. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1935.

Smith, David Nichol, ed. Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.

Smith, David Nichol. Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928.

Spencer, Christopher, ed. Five Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1965.

Spencer, Hazelton. Shakespeare Improved: The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927.

Summers, Montague, ed., Shakespeare Adaptations. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1922.

Sutherland, James R. "The Dull Duty of an Editor." Essential Articles for the Study of Alexander Pope. Ed. Maynard Mack. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1968, pp. 675-694.

Sutherland, James R. "Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century." MLR, 28 (1933), 21-39.

Sutherland, James R., ed. Three Plays by Nicholas Rowe. London: The Scholartis Press, 1929.

Theobald, Lewis. Preface to the Works of Shakespeare (1735). Intro. Hugh G. Dick. The Augustan Reprint Society, Extra Series #2, Pub. #20. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1949.

Theobald, Lewis. Shakespeare Restored: An Attempt to Correct Mr. Pope's Most Erroneous Edition, etc. 1726; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Theobald, Lewis. The Works of Shakespeare. 7 vols. 1734; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

Thorpe, James E. The Task of the Editor. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Univ. of California, 1969.

Tillotson, Geoffrey. Pope and Human Nature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Velz, John W. Shakespeare and the Classical Tradition: A Critical Guide to Commentary, 1660-1960. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1968.

Wagenknecht, Edward. "The First Editor of Shakespeare." Colophon, 8 (1931).

Walder, Ernest. Shakspearian Criticism: Textual and Literary, From Dryden to the End of the Eighteenth Century. 1895; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1972.

Walker, Alice. "Collateral Substantive Texts." Studies in Bibliography, 7 (1955), 51-67.

Walker, Alice. "Compositor Determination and Other Problems in Shakespearian Texts." Studies in Bibliography, 7 (1955), 3-15.

Walker, Alice. "Edward Capell and his Edition of Shakespeare." Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1960. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960.

Walker, Alice. Textual Problems of the First Folio. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1953.

Walton, J.K. "Edmond Malone: an Irish Shakespeare Scholar." Hermathena, 99 (1964), 5-26.

Walton, J.K. The Quarto Copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare. Dublin: Dublin Univ. Press, 1971.

Warburton, William. The Works of Shakespear. 8 vols. 1747; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

Wasserman, Earl. "Elizabethan Poetry 'Improved.'" Modern Philology, 37 (1939-40), 357-69.

Wheatley, H.B. "Shakespeare's Editors: 1623 to the Twentieth Century." Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, 14 (Oct. 1915-March 1917), 145-74.

Willoughby, E.E. The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932.

Wilson, F.P. Shakespeare and the New Bibliography. Rev. & ed. by Helen Gardner. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Wilson, John Dover. "The New Way with Shakespeare's Text." Shakespeare Survey, 7 (1954), 48-56; 9 (1956), 69-80; 10 (1957), 78-88.

Wilson, John Dover, ed., Romeo and Juliet. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1955.

Wimsatt, W.K. Jr., ed. Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.

Appendix A

Analysis of Pope's Original Emendations in Othello.

Act 1, Scene 1

5 contractions.

5 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 1, Scene 2

2 contractions.
1 contraction changed (i.e. "'Tis" to "It's").

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

Act 1, Scene 3

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

6 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
7 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 1

4 contractions.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 2

1 addition of stage setting.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

3 contractions.
1 contraction expanded to two words.

6 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 3, Scene 1

1 contraction.

5 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

Act 3, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

Act 3, Scene 3

13 contractions.

14 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word is omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
9 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 3, Scene 4

6 contractions.

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 4, Scene 1

2 contractions.
1 contraction changed (i.e. "y'are" to "you're ").

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 2

5 contractions.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 3

1 contraction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 1

3 contractions.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 2

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

7 contractions.

9 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

4 occasions where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

1 reversal of word order.

TOTALS

Total number of alterations	221
Number concerned with staging	4
Number concerned with meter	147
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	23
Number concerned with meaning	34
Number for other reasons	13

Analysis of Pope's Use of the 1597 Quarto (Q1) Edition of *Romeo and Juliet*

Act 1, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 1, Scene 2

No occasions where Pope definitely uses Q1.

Act 1, Scene 3

No occasions where Pope definitely uses Q1.

Act 1, Scene 4

6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 1, Scene 5

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve grammar.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 2, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 2

3 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve meter.

Act 2, Scene 3

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 4

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 5

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 3

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 3, Scene 4

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 5

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
8 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 alteration of line location.

Act 4, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

11 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 2

No occasion where Pope definitely uses Q1.

Act 4, Scene 3

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 4

No occasions where Pope definitely uses Q1.

Act 4, Scene 5

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 2

No occasions where Pope definitely uses Q1.

Act 5, Scene 3

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

TOTALS

Number of times Pope definitely follows Q1	100
Number concerned with meter	10
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	10
Number concerned with meaning	70
Number for other reasons	10

Appendix B

Analysis of Capell's Original Emendations in *Othello*

Act 1, Scene 1

2 additions of stage directions.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 1, Scene 2

1 addition of stage direction.

Act 1, Scene 3

3 additions of stage directions.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 contraction.
1 contraction expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 misprint.

Act 2, Scene 1

7 additions of stage directions.
2 alterations of wording of stage directions.

1 contraction.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 2

5 additions of stage directions.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

2 contractions.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 3, Scene 1

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.
1 word change - corrected in errata.

Act 3, Scene 2

No original emendations.

Act 3, Scene 3

3 additions of stage directions.

1 contraction expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 line omitted - corrected in Notes.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 3, Scene 4

1 stage direction added.
1 alteration of placement of stage direction.

1 contraction.
1 contraction expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

1 reversal of word order.

1 misprint.

Act 4, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.
1 alteration of placement of stage direction.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 word change - corrected in errata.

Act 4, Scene 2

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 word change - corrected in errata.

Act 4, Scene 3

4 additions of stage directions.

2 contractions.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

Act 5, Scene 1

2 additions of stage directions.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 5, Scene 2

3 additions of stage directions.

2 contractions.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

TOTALS

Total number of alterations	116
Number concerned with staging	40
Number concerned with meter	44
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	6
Number concerned with meaning	19
Number for other reasons	7

Capell's Use of Editions other than F1 or Qq in *Othello*

Folios 2, 3, & 4

1 word omitted for non-metrical reasons.
1 word added to clarify meaning.
7 words changed to improve grammar.
9 words changed to clarify meaning.
23 words changed to modernize or correct spelling.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 41

Rowe

6 stage directions.
1 contraction.
3 words changed to improve grammar.
6 words changed to clarify meaning.
12 words changed to modernize or correct spelling.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 28

Pope

1 stage direction.
1 change of placement of stage direction.
1 contraction.
2 words added in order to improve meter.

5 words omitted to improve meter.
3 words changed to improve meter.
2 words changed to improve grammar.
5 words changed to clarify meaning.
2 words changed to modernize or correct spelling.
1 reversal of word order.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 23

Theobald

3 stage directions.
2 words added to improve meter.
14 words changed to clarify meaning.
9 words changed to modernize or correct spelling.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 28

Hanmer

1 stage direction.
3 words added to improve meter.
1 word changed to improve meter.
1 word changed to improve grammar.
4 words changed to clarify meaning.
2 reversals of word order.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 12

Warburton

1 word changed to clarify meaning.
1 word changed to modernize or correct spelling.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 2

Upton

1 word added to clarify meaning.
1 word changed to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 2

Analysis of Capell's Original Emendations in Romeo and Juliet

Act 1, Scene 1

2 additions of stage directions.
3 alterations of wording of stage directions.

1 contraction.

Act 1, Scene 2

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 1, Scene 3

3 contractions.

3 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 1, Scene 4

3 additions of stage directions.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

Act 1, Scene 5

10 additions of stage directions.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.
1 alteration of position of stage direction.
1 omission of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 1

2 additions of stage directions.

3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 2, Scene 2

5 additions of stage directions.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 3

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 4

2 additions of stage directions.

1 contraction.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 5

1 addition of stage direction.

Act 2, Scene 6

1 addition of stage direction.

Act 3, Scene 1

7 additions of stage directions.
3 alterations of wording of stage direction.

1 contraction.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.
1 word omitted - corrected in Notes.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.
1 word change - corrected in errata.

3 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 3, Scene 2

4 additions of stage directions.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 3

5 additions of stage directions.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

2 occasions where a word or words are omitted for non-metrical reasons.

2 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

Act 3, Scene 4

2 additions of stage directions.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 3, Scene 5

4 additions of stage directions.
2 alterations of wording of stage directions.

2 contractions.

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

3 occasions where the form of a word is changed ("and" to "an").

Act 4, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed for purposes of modernization.

Act 4, Scene 2

3 additions of stage directions.

Act 4, Scene 3

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar (in errata).

Act 4, Scene 4

1 addition of stage direction.
2 alterations of wording of stage direction.
1 alteration of position of stage direction.

Act 4, Scene 5

4 additions of stage direction.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

4 alterations in designation of chateracters' names.

Act 5, Scene 1

1 addition of stage direction.

1 occasion where a word or words are altered inorder to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 2

1 addition of stage direction.

Act 5, Scene 3

28 additions of stage directions.
1 omission of stage direction.
2 alterations of wording of stage directions.

1 contraction.

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 occasion where the form of a word is changed in order to improve grammar.

TOTALS

Total number of alterations	185
Number concerned with staging	110
Number concerned with meter	22
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	14
Number concerned with meaning	30
Number for other reasons	9

Analysis of Capell's Use of Qq other than Q3 in *Romeo and Juliet*

Note: Capell used Q3 (1609) as his copy-text. He also possessed copies of Q1 (1597), Q2 (1599), Q4 (no date), and Q5 (1637).

Act 1, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are added in order to clarify meaning.

Act 1, Scene 2

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 1, Scene 3

No use of quarto editions.

Act 1, Scene 4

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 1, Scene 5

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
6 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 3

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

1 reversal of word order.

Act 2, Scene 4

1 contraction expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are omitted in order to improve meter.

3 occasions where a word or words are added in order to improve meter.

8 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 2, Scene 5

No use of quarto editions.

Act 2, Scene 6

No use of quarto editions.

Act 3, Scene 1

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 3, Scene 3

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

1 contraction expanded to two words.

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve meter.
2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 3, Scene 4

No use of quarto editions.

Act 3, Scene 5

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
5 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 1

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 4, Scene 2

1 reversal of word order.

Act 4, Scene 3

No use of quarto editions.

Act 4, Scene 4

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.

Act 4, Scene 5

4 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 1

2 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.
1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

Act 5, Scene 2

1 occasion where a word or words are changed in order to improve grammar.

Act 5, Scene 3

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.
3 occasions where a word or words are changed in order to clarify meaning.

TOTALS

Total number of alterations	65
Number concerned with staging	3
Number concerned with meter	13
Number concerned with grammar or modernization	8
Number concerned with meaning	41

Note: Of the 65 readings taken from quartos other than Q3, 47 are from Q1, 5 are from Q2, 5 are from Q4, and 8 are from Q5.

Capell's Use of Editions other than Qq in *Romeo and Juliet*

Ff

1 change of placement of stage direction.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.
2 words omitted for non-metrical reasons.
3 words added to improve meter.
6 words changed to improve grammar.
13 words changed to clarify meaning.
11 words changed to modernize or correct spelling.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 37

Rowe

1 stage direction
2 alterations of wording of stage direction.
1 contraction.
1 word added to improve meter.
2 words changed to improve grammar.
4 words changed to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 11

Pope

2 contractions.
1 word omitted for non-metrical reasons.
2 words omitted to improve meter.
2 words added to improve meter.
1 word added to clarify meaning.
4 words changed to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 12

Theobald

1 stage direction.
1 alteration of wording of stage direction.
3 words added to improve meter.
2 words changed to improve meter.
3 words changed to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 10

Hanmer

1 alteration of wording of stage direction.
1 word added to improve meter.
2 words changed to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 4

Warburton

1 word changed to clarify meaning.

TOTAL ADOPTIONS = 1